

some Bolshevik, who will mouth a little bit about them; and every time he opens his foul lips to say anything against the sale of these bonds he will only increase the market. It is utter nonsense to talk about the sale of the bonds depending upon the passage of a bill of this character. It is not true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not desire to make a formal objection. I am asking the Senator to go on with this matter. Let us take up these amendments and pass upon them in an orderly way. Nobody is going to be hurt. We all want to enact a proper statute; but do not let us be rushed into a hasty agreement on the ground that otherwise the bonds will not sell.

I expect to go out and give some of my time to helping persuade people to buy these bonds, and I expect to do as I did on the other bond issue—to bankrupt myself temporarily and borrow money to buy bonds. Almost everybody else in the United States is going to do the same thing; but the sale of the bonds does not depend upon the enactment of this statute.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the sale of the bonds depended upon the enactment of this bill, we would not place the loan at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will not accede to my request, which I think is reasonable, I am going to object to unanimous consent to a vote at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That disposes of the matter.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator is not insistent in regard to going on with the amendments this afternoon?

Mr. REED. I am perfectly willing to go right along with them, and after the principal amendments are disposed of I would just as soon come to a vote.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let us vote on the amendments, then, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, on page 2, line 6, after the word "statements" to insert "or say or do anything except by way of bona fide and not disloyal advice to an investor or investors."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 12, after the word "cause," to insert "or incite or attempt to incite."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 15, after the word "obstruct," to insert "or discourage or willfully attempt to obstruct or discourage."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 16, after the words "United States," to strike out "to the injury of the service or of the United States," and insert "and whoever, when the United States is at war, shall utter, print, write, or publish any disloyal, profane, scurrilous, contemptuous, or abusive language about the form of government of the United States, or the Constitution of the United States, or the soldiers or sailors of the United States, or the flag of the United States, or the uniform of the Army or Navy of the United States, or any language calculated to bring the form of government of the United States, or the Constitution of the United States, or the soldiers or sailors of the United States, or the flag of the United States, or the uniform of the Army or Navy of the United States into contempt, scorn, contumely, or disrepute, or shall utter, print, write, or publish any language calculated to incite or inflame resistance to any duly constituted Federal or State authority in connection with the prosecution of the war, or shall display the flag of any foreign enemy, or shall by utterance, writing, printing, publication, or language spoken, urge, incite, or advocate any curtailment of production in this country of any thing or things, product or products, necessary or essential to the prosecution of the war in which the United States may be engaged, with intent by such curtailment to cripple or hinder the United States in the prosecution of the war, and whoever shall advocate, favor, teach, defend, or suggest the doing of any of the acts or things in this section enumerated, and whoever shall by word or act support or favor the cause of the German Empire or its allies in the present war or by word or act oppose the cause of the United States therein."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment of the committee by inserting the word "willfully," on line 18, page 2, between the words "shall" and "utter"; also the same word on page 3, line 4, between the words "shall" and "utter"; also on line 7, between the words "shall" and "disloyal"; also on line 14, between the words "shall" and "advocate."

Mr. BORAH. What page?

Mr. THOMAS. Page 3.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I think that is putting useless verbiage in the bill. I do not see how a man can utter any disloyal, profane, scurrilous, contemptuous, or abusive language about anything without willfully speaking the words, without intending to do it, unless he did it in his sleep or while he was delirious or while he was insane. Those are the only three exceptions of which I can think. If you are going to put in the word "willfully," some highly technical judge will simply extend the meaning of the word "willfully" to more than it ought to qualify, and we shall have decisions that a man must willfully intend to defame the form of government of the United States, or the Constitution of the United States, or the soldiers or sailors of the United States. Every qualification that you put in there is simply going to make the law harder to enforce, and going to make the spirit of it harder to carry out. I think the law ought to be as it is in the State of Montana, that a man who utters words of that character is conclusively presumed to know what he is doing and is guilty under this act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this is a very important amendment. I make the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Kendrick	Phelan	Thomas
Borah	King	Reed	Tillman
Colt	Lewis	Robinson	Townsend
Cummins	Lodge	Shaftroth	Underwood
Fall	McNary	Sheppard	Vardaman
France	Martin	Smith, Ariz.	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Myers	Smith, S. C.	
Gallinger	Nelson	Smoot	
Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Swanson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have taken no part in the debate. I presume I have no right to say much; but I will ask the Senator from North Carolina to move an adjournment now. I think he will make more progress with his bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I am inclined to think so. The Senator from New Hampshire, who always does his duty, had left the Chamber, and has returned to it, notwithstanding sickness in his family. Appreciating what we asked for, he returned to the Chamber under those circumstances. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, April 6, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, April 5, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everliving God our Heavenly Father, in whom all wisdom, power, and goodness are centered, we lift up our hearts in fervent prayer with the millions who are at this moment praying for the success of our allied forces, who are engaged in a most terrific battle against the barbarians who would break through all barriers and check the onward march of civilization so well begun and so far advanced.

Give, we beseech Thee, courage, strength, victory to our arms, that liberty, justice, peace, and righteousness may live, a blessing to untold generations; and all praise we will ascribe to Thee, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RATIFICATION OF PROHIBITION AMENDMENT BY DELAWARE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has a communication from the secretary of state of Delaware announcing the ratification by the legislature of that State of the prohibition amendment. The communication will be filed.

HERBERT A. MEYER.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House resolution 297, directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House the facts in reference to the issuance of a commission as captain to Herbert A. Meyer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 297.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish to the House, for information of the House, as soon as practicable, the facts in reference to the issuance of a commission to Herbert A. Meyer as captain in the Aviation Section of the Signal Corps; also any information as to whether the recent official statements of the War Department discontinuing the issuance of commissions in the Army of the United States to persons in civil life and to registrants under the selective-draft act of May 18, 1917, were violated in the case of Herbert A. Meyer; also a list of all commissions which have been issued in violation of such procedure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KITCHIN. Reserving the right to object, I did not catch exactly the purpose of that resolution.

Mr. ANTHONY. It is a resolution asking the War Department for information with reference to certain appointments in the Army. The resolution is reported favorably from the Committee on Military Affairs and is now on the calendar.

Mr. KITCHIN. Was it unanimously reported?

Mr. ANTHONY. It was.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, what is the purpose of the resolution of inquiry?

Mr. ANTHONY. The purpose of the resolution of inquiry is to get some information from the War Department in regard to appointments which are reported to have been made of men who are registered and liable to draft and about to be called to duty who have been given commissions in the Army and assigned to noncombatant places. It seems that about four or five months ago the War Department, through its bureau chiefs, in letters to Members of Congress and others, announced that it was its purpose henceforth not to give any more appointments in the Army to men who were registered under the selective draft law. Members of Congress so notified their constituents, and it was generally accepted all over the country that that was to be the policy of the department. In spite of that statement from the department we find that commissions have been issued to men who are registered under the draft who are about to be called to service, and that in many cases these men are commissioned to safety-first, noncombatant places. The committee believed that that was hardly fair, and we wanted full information as to the extent to which this pernicious practice has been allowed to go on.

Mr. KITCHIN. As I understood the gentleman to answer me a while ago, this is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. ANTHONY. It is.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

PENSIONS.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of an omnibus pension bill that should have been passed two weeks ago to-day. I understand there is no objection to it.

The SPEAKER. This is not pension day.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know it is not, but I ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of an omnibus pension bill. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is it just one bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. One bill from the Invalid Pensions Committee. I think the Pensions Committee have two small bills, but the chairman of that committee has not come in yet.

Mr. WALSH. The bill from the Invalid Pensions Committee, I understand, is a short one.

Mr. RUSSELL. A short bill. I do not think it will take 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. What is the number of the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. 10850.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Private Calendar.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill (H. R. 10850) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of John S. Mott, late of Company E, One hundred and eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Arabella Miller, widow of William Miller, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Joshua Markley, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael P. Wells, late of Company A, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew King, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lafayette Crouser, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Johnson, late of Company H, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hugh Thompson, late of Company C, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George J. Wilson, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isabella C. Waddell, late a nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Edward O. Wright, late of Company E, Second Regiment New York Veteran Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Orrin J. Belden, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Lantz, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Conkle, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Cavalry, and Company —, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Rowland, late of Company E, Thirty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel H. Samples, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wilson Gaskill, late of Company C, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Eply, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Newitt F. Gorrell, late of Company D, Forty-fifth Regiment, and Company F, Fiftieth Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jonas F. Fortney, late of Company B, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ambrose Wells, late of Company C, One hundred and seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Schmook, late of Company F, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment, and Company C, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Johnson Harris, late of Company I, Twenty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha E. Sellers, widow of Samuel S. Sellers, late of Capt. Gilbreath's company, Independent Scouts and Guides of Alabama, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of William Criswell, late of Company G, Eighty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theresa E. Bright, former widow of Henson Bright, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of David E. Rench, late of Company B, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abraham Lanham, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi Mattern, late of Company F, One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Seth W. Gray, late of Companies I and L, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Mitzel, late of Companies H and C, Fifty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Kilgore, late of Company K, Forty-second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Roads, late of the Second Independent Battery, Wisconsin Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alonzo W. Covert, late of Company I, Twenty-fifth Regiment, and Company B, Ninth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin Guthrie, helpless and dependent child of Perry Guthrie, late of Company K, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of David Compton, late of Company K, Sixty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Third Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George S. Winans, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Katie Edds, helpless and dependent child of Finis Edds, late of Company C, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Robert McGill, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Houts, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Butler George, late of Company E, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Klinedinst, late of Company D, Eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Myron I. Hartwell, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry H. Crane, late of Company B and G, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucius A. West, late of Company M, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Krieger, late of Company K, One hundred and first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James D. Montgomery, late of Company D, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph M. Wagner, alias Joseph Mann, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Leathers, late of Company G, Sixtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Lakey, late of Company A, Seventy-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James G. B. Lamb, late of Company K, Twenty-sixth Regiment, and Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Story, late of Company K, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Shoup, late of Company B, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Gooding, late of Company F, One hundred and seventieth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Burkhart, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Harris, late of Company C, Nineteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Esto A. Makepeace, late of Company B, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James D. Webb, late of Company G, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nicholas Wetzel, late of Company L, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Page, late of Company E, Maine Coast Guards Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Van Riper, late of Company A, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Shoeman, widow of David Shoeman, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Hezekiah S. Williams, alias Hezekiah Straw, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Horace W. Brown, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas A. Jamison, late of Company G, Forty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William M. Henderson, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Rosborough, late of Company E, Thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Williams Sollars, late of Companies A and D, Forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oliver J. Boord, late of Company C, Eighty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alice L. Enloe, helpless and dependent child of Edwin T. Enloe, late of Company D, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Van Schoyk, late of Company I, Thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob P. Ellis, late of Company B, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucretia Napier, dependent mother of Richard Napier, late of Company H, Fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Seth K. Coats, late of Company D, Thirty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jasper N. Woods, late of Company C, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James K. P. Morelock, late of Company B, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel McCammon, late of Company A, Thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi P. Fodrea, late of Company A, One hundred and first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David R. Pringle, late of Company E, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jeremiah Hyatt, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jarrett E. Burgess, late of Company K, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Lemon, late of the Twenty-second Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Arthur W. Brittingham, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of L. Ethel Bolton, helpless and dependent child of Charles W. Bolton, late of Company I, Ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Maggie L. Oliver, helpless and dependent child of John M. Oliver, late of Company F, Thirty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Phillip Kissel, late of Company B, First Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ambrose J. Knapp, late of Company A, Third New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Milton T. Monroe, late of Company A, Eighty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Aultman, late of Company I, One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elias B. Green, late of Battery D, Third New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna Branigan, widow of John J. Branigan, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment, and Company L, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of John M. Culver, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Berry, widow of Caleb Berry, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Isaac L. Prescott, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Newton, late of Company A, Nineteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Kendall, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cyrus Riffe, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Powers, late of Company E, Thirty-ninth Regiment, and unassigned, Thirty-third Regiment, New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry J. Olmstead, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Robison, late of Company B, One hundred and eighty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eli Shidler, late of Company K, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin Andrews, late of Company D, Hatch's battalion, Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Uriah Smith, alias William Edwards, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth A. Munday, former widow of Donaldson Martin, late of Company B, Eighty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Daniel Ault, late of Company F, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William R. Brummett, late of Company E, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eva M. Bevier, widow of James E. Bevier, late of Company H, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Eli Abbott, late of Company D, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Merchee, late of Company L, Third Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Crooks, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nelson White, late of Company F, Fortieth Regiment and Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Kiplinger, widow of Reuben D. Kiplinger, late of Company C, Forty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of David L. Buchanan, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Chester E. Kye, late of Company A, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Mounted Rifles, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mortimer L. Woodward, late of Company G, Forty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jeremiah McIntosh, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael Ham, late of Company H, Forty-sixth Regiment, and Company G, One hundred and eighty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edmon Wade West, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel J. Vaughn, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank W. Henninger, late of Company D, One hundred and ninety-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Garrison J. Jaques, late of Company D, Ninety-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah L. Seltzer, widow of A. Frank Seltzer, late of Company G, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Charles G. Mack, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James C. Moore, late of Company G, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Irving Holcomb, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philo M. Russell, late of Company G, Twenty-eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. McGhee, late of Company H, Thirty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Harper, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eli Smith, late of Company K, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rachel Woggerman, former widow of Daniel Lobaugh, late of Company F, Seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of John Wisner, late of Company K, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment, and Company E, Forty-sixth Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry B. Towner, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Reuben Sumpter, late of Battery A, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Williamson, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Robinson, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Cross, late of Company L, Third Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David G. R. Potec, late of Company I, Fifty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Croasmun, widow of Oliver Croasmun, late of Company A, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of John H. Nickerson, late of Company D, Third Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William D. Dunkerson, late of Company B, Seventeenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Jacoby, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William G. Abbott, late of Company B, Fifty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sabina Chaney, former widow of William J. Burcham, late of Company C, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Michael Reichert, late of Company H, Thirty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Hollander, late of Company I, Twenty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William T. Eager, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aaron Hall, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Fifty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William S. Kiddey, late of Company K, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Martin, late of Company D, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, First Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Sprague, now Eit, dependent mother of George W. Sprague, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry Weitzel, late of Company F, Fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Logan, late of Company D, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marcus L. K. Wells, late of Company C, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William P. Dorton, late of Company G, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patton Coomer, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Uriah T. Alley, late of Company L, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edgar W. Lauck, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Columbus Sampson, late of Companies F and C, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Second Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Campbell, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry G. C. Rose, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Infantry, and Thirty-seventh Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John P. Simonds, late of Company H, First Regiment New York Volunteer Mounted Rifles, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John B. Williams, late of Company M, Twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. Burk, late of Company K, Thirty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 594. John S. Mott.	H. R. 6991. Joseph M. Wagner, alias Joseph Mann.
H. R. 788. Arabella Miller.	H. R. 7109. John W. Leathers.
H. R. 1350. Joshua Markley.	H. R. 7200. Charles H. Lakey.
H. R. 1362. Michael P. Wells.	H. R. 7202. James G. B. Lamb.
H. R. 1380. Andrew King.	H. R. 7210. Charles Story.
H. R. 1382. Lafayette Crouser.	H. R. 7216. John Shoup.
H. R. 1483. Thomas Johnson.	H. R. 7278. Samuel Goding.
H. R. 1941. Hugh Thompson.	H. R. 7308. Joseph Burkhart.
H. R. 1986. George J. Wilson.	H. R. 7371. Robert Harris.
H. R. 2038. Isabella C. Waddell.	H. R. 7373. Esto A. Makepeace.
H. R. 2519. Edward C. Wright.	H. R. 7420. James D. Webb.
H. R. 2520. Orrin J. Belden.	H. R. 7482. Nicholas Wetzel.
H. R. 2558. David Lantz.	H. R. 7490. James W. Page.
H. R. 2761. Jacob Conkie.	H. R. 7508. James Van Ripper.
H. R. 2802. James W. Rowland.	H. R. 7612. Elizabeth Shoeman.
H. R. 3513. Samuel H. Samples.	H. R. 7706. Hezekiah S. Williams, alias Hezekiah Straw.
H. R. 3595. Wilson Gaskill.	H. R. 7755. Horace W. Brown.
H. R. 3598. William H. Eply.	H. R. 7805. Thomas A. Jamison.
H. R. 3870. Newitt F. Gorrell.	H. R. 7819. William M. Henderson.
H. R. 4387. Jonas F. Fortney.	H. R. 7823. William J. Rosborough.
H. R. 4621. Ambrose Wells.	H. R. 8080. William Sollars.
H. R. 4751. William Schmook.	H. R. 8112. Oliver J. Boord.
H. R. 5233. Johnson Harris.	H. R. 8123. Alice L. Enloe.
H. R. 5304. Martha E. Sellers.	H. R. 8136. John Van Schoyk.
H. R. 5330. William Criswell.	H. R. 8155. Jacob P. Ellis.
H. R. 5352. Theresa E. Bright.	H. R. 8206. Lucretia Napier.
H. R. 5355. David E. Rench.	H. R. 8220. Seth K. Coats.
H. R. 5464. Abraham Lanham.	H. R. 8262. Jasper N. Woods.
H. R. 5503. Levi Mattern.	H. R. 8284. James K. P. Morelock.
H. R. 5603. Seth W. Gray.	H. R. 8285. Daniel McCammon.
H. R. 5618. David Mitzel.	H. R. 8475. Levi P. Fodren.
H. R. 5754. Charles Kilgore.	H. R. 8483. David R. Pringle.
H. R. 5759. John W. Roads.	H. R. 8510. Jeremiah Hyatt.
H. R. 5844. Alonzo W. Covert.	H. R. 8526. Jarrett E. Burgess.
H. R. 5921. Martin Guthrie.	H. R. 8537. David Lemon.
H. R. 5946. David Compton.	H. R. 8671. Arthur W. Brittingham.
H. R. 6207. George S. Winans.	H. R. 8794. L. Ethel Bolton.
H. R. 6423. Katie Edds.	H. R. 8818. Margie L. Oliver.
H. R. 6471. Robert McGill.	H. R. 8955. Philip Kissel.
H. R. 6475. George House.	H. R. 9020. Ambrose J. Knapp.
H. R. 6498. Butler George.	H. R. 9113. Milton T. Monroe.
H. R. 6557. Alexander Klinedinst.	H. R. 9125. William A. Aultman.
H. R. 6686. Myron I. Hartwell.	H. R. 9154. Elias B. Green.
H. R. 6804. Henry H. Crane.	H. R. 9177. Annie Branigan.
H. R. 6806. Lucius A. West.	H. R. 9231. John M. Culver.
H. R. 6814. Jacob Krieger.	
H. R. 6834. James D. Montgomery.	

H. R. 9419. Margaret Berry.
 H. R. 9433. Isaac L. Prescott.
 H. R. 9447. William Newton.
 H. R. 9448. William H. Kendall.
 H. R. 9471. Cyrus Riffe.
 H. R. 9472. James Powers.
 H. R. 9526. Henry J. Olmstead.
 H. R. 9595. John M. Robison.
 H. R. 9596. Eli Shidler.
 H. R. 9606. Edwin Andrews.
 H. R. 9658. Uriah Smith, alias William Edwards.
 H. R. 9660. Elizabeth A. Munday.
 H. R. 9676. Daniel Ault.
 H. R. 9687. William R. Brummett.
 H. R. 9742. Eva M. Bevier.
 H. R. 9745. Eli Abbott.
 H. R. 9763. John Megehee.
 H. R. 9851. Henry C. Crooks.
 H. R. 9859. Nelson White.
 H. R. 9938. Mary A. Kiplinger.
 H. R. 9940. David L. Buchannan.
 H. R. 9954. Chester E. Kyte.
 H. R. 9982. Mortimer L. Woodward.
 H. R. 9983. Jeremiah McIntosh.
 H. R. 10002. Michael Ham.
 H. R. 10004. Edmon Wade West.
 H. R. 10030. Samuel J. Vaughn.
 H. R. 10116. Frank W. Henninger.
 H. R. 10169. Garrison J. Jaques.
 H. R. 10173. Sarah L. Seltzer.
 H. R. 10174. Charles G. Mack.
 H. R. 10179. James C. Moore.
 H. R. 10212. Irving Holcomb.
 H. R. 10222. Philo M. Russell.
 H. R. 10229. William C. McGhee.
 H. R. 10248. Robert Harper.
 H. R. 10256. Eli Smith.
 H. R. 10280. Rachel Woggerman.
 H. R. 10276. John J. Wisner.
 H. R. 10278. Henry B. Townner.
 H. R. 10279. Reuben Sumpter.
 H. R. 10283. James Williamson.
 H. R. 10315. William W. Robinson.
 H. R. 10341. Charles W. Cross.
 H. R. 10345. David G. R. Poteet.
 H. R. 10374. Mary E. Croasmun.
 H. R. 10382. John H. Nickerson.
 H. R. 10383. William D. Dunkerson.
 H. R. 10388. Peter Jacoby.
 H. R. 10389. William G. Abbott.
 H. R. 10402. Sabina Chaney.
 H. R. 10420. Michael Reichert.
 H. R. 10421. John A. Hollander.
 H. R. 10441. William T. Eager.
 H. R. 10442. Aaron Hall.
 H. R. 10449. William S. Kiddey.
 H. R. 10451. Andrew J. Martin.
 H. R. 10461. Mary Sprague, now Ett.
 H. R. 10465. Henry Weitzel.
 H. R. 10489. William Logan.
 H. R. 10497. Marcus L. K. Wells.
 H. R. 10498. William P. Dorton.
 H. R. 10528. Patton Coomer.
 H. R. 10532. Uriah T. Alley.
 H. R. 10538. Edgar W. Lauck.
 H. R. 10541. Columbus Sampson.
 H. R. 10545. William A. Campbell.
 H. R. 10566. Henry G. C. Rose.
 H. R. 10574. John P. Simonds.
 H. R. 10576. John B. Williams.
 H. R. 10806. James A. Burk.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. RUSSELL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up a pension bill, House bill 10924.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a pension bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 10924) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman intend to call up any other bills?

Mr. TILLMAN. This is the only bill, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. WALSH. It is a short bill?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of George W. Keenan, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James E. Martin, late of Company M, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John P. Kirby, late of Company H, Ninth Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas E. Tanner, late of Company H, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Leslie G. Phillips, alias Gordon L. Phillips, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Orville C. Bolt, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lorenzo D. Romine, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James A. Annas, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank A. Crawford, late of Troop D, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles H. Howell, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Bernhard Bolen, late of Company A, Thirtieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Fred Yeomans, late of Troop C, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, and Company L, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Groth, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Percy H. Allen, late of Company F, Second Battalion of Engineers, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leo A. Kelly, late of Companies E and H, Twenty-sixth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Margaret C. Fargo, dependent mother of William H. Fargo, deceased, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of T. McElvany, late of Company C-2, Arkansas Veteran Infantry, and Company K, Thirty-third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Otis H. Siderer, late of Company F, Thirty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank C. Barrow, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Louis Settles, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joshua W. Reed, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julian A. Wiggins, late of Company M, First Regiment Texas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of James L. Henderson, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis Spele, late of Troop A, Ninth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George A. Holmes, late of Company H, Forty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles A. Swander, late of Company C, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary Diven, dependent mother of Edward T. Diven, jr., deceased, late of Company I, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William J. McCabe, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eugene A. Hendricks, late of Company A, First Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mace H. Corsbie, late of Company B, Second Regiment Mississippi Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to said committee:

H. R. 1432. George W. Keenan.	H. R. 7322. Otis H. Siderer.
H. R. 1819. James E. Martin.	H. R. 8217. Frank C. Barrow.
H. R. 2238. John P. Kirby.	H. R. 8684. Louis Settles.
H. R. 2244. Thomas E. Tanner.	H. R. 9207. Joshua W. Reed.
H. R. 2246. Leslie G. Phillips, alias Gordon L. Phillips.	H. R. 9365. Lewis Spele.
H. R. 2422. Orville C. Bolt.	H. R. 9421. Julian A. Wiggins.
H. R. 2276. Lorenzo D. Romine.	H. R. 9463. James L. Henderson.
H. R. 2280. James A. Annas.	H. R. 9484. George A. Holmes.
H. R. 3887. Frank A. Crawford.	H. R. 9892. Charles A. Swander.
H. R. 4011. Charles H. Howell.	H. R. 10053. William J. McCabe.
H. R. 4080. Bernhard Bolen.	H. R. 10133. Mary Diven.
H. R. 4291. Fred Yeomans.	H. R. 10146. Eugene A. Hendricks.
H. R. 6238. Percy H. Allen.	H. R. 10584. Mace H. Corsbie.
H. R. 6340. Leo A. Kelly.	H. R. 15567. John Groth.
H. R. 6568. Margaret C. Fargo.	H. R. 73112. T. McElvany.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to the final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. TILLMAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 9352. An act to amend an act entitled "An act providing for an Assistant Secretary of War," approved March 5, 1890, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported on April 4, 1918, that they presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bill:

H. R. 11123. An act to amend an act approved September 24, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize an additional issue of bonds

to meet expenditures for the national security and defense and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to extend additional credit to foreign Governments, and for other purposes."

BRIDGE ACROSS CLARK FORK RIVER, BONNER COUNTY, IDAHO.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 4102, and consider the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 4102, a bridge bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

An act (S. 4102) granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Bonner County, Idaho, to construct a bridge across the Clark Fork River in Bonner County, Idaho.

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the county commissioners of Bonner County, Idaho, and their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Clark Fork River, in Bonner County, Idaho, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the village of Clark Fork, in the county of Bonner, in the State of Idaho, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FRENCH, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The bill (H. R. 10593) of similar tenor was laid on the table.

PENSIONS.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 10843, a pension bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to take up the bill H. R. 10843, a pension bill. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, when was this bill reported?

Mr. LINTHICUM. On March 19, 1918.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10843) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Andrew Heuser, late of the United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of James Park, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edmund S. Auld, alias Storey E. Auld, late of Company K, First Regiment North Dakota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jeddo Q. McNatt, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James R. Hays, late of Troop L, First Texas Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William L. Snider, late of Company I, First Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas J. Harris, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George Tuffensam, late of Company M, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Pauline A. Randt, dependent mother of John W. Randt, deceased, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Andrew E. Younginer, late of the Thirteenth Recruit Company, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George H. McCauley, late of Company G, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Dick Parker, late of Company A, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Francis O. Nash, late acting assistant surgeon in the United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry W. Kappes, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Eddy R. Stevens, late first lieutenant, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Arthur H. Loomis, late of Company E, Twenty-second Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Howard A. Littlejohn, late of Heavy Battery, South Carolina Volunteer Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Pollock T. Harbold, late of Company M, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Lemial S. Darr, late of Troop B, Eighth United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Frank W. Allen, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph E. Neargarder, late of United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wilburn Hall, late of Company A, Second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George W. Bean, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harry Owen, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John Ashton, late of Company E, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John T. Garrett, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ralph A. Finicle, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Arthur J. Jerome, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John E. Root, late of Troop D, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Pearley P. Beal, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of David Mann, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Greene B. Caywood, late of Company A, Second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Roscoe Wilkins, late of Eleventh Recruit Company, General Service Infantry, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Trigg Lewis, late of Company G, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph Harris, late of Troop C, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Smoot, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Carl Z. Werk, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George M. Federkiel, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank A. Pfeifferle, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Martin L. Payne, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George W. Hyland, late of Company I, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Walter L. Jewell, late of Troop B, Thirteenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Leo Voelker, late of Company B, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William V. Schwoyer, late of Company M, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Howard E. Hare, late of the Eighteenth Company, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edward P. Gallagher, late of Company G, Two hundred and third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George W. Boling, late of Company H, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Schiller, late of Troop B, First Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Simpkins, late of Company D, Forty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Robert Dinsmore, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hulbert O. White, dependent father of Claude R. White, deceased, late of Company A, Twenty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Weddington, late of the Eighteenth Company United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Michael Lacey, late of Company L, Third Battalion Engineers, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles L. Johnson, late of Troop M, First Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John D. Bridgman, late of Battery B, Utah Volunteer Light Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Craig, late of Company D, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Charles F. Sparger, late of Company K, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Shirley, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles L. McClure, late of Company M, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Thrash, late of Troop A, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Amos H. Archer, late of Company D, Second Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Franklin A. Peters, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, and Company E, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of William Lehsing, late of Troop K, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Bernard Klatt, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and Troop I, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of William F. Graham, late of Company D, Third Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Olaf H. Heieie, late of the United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Elmer R. Harrington, late of Company A, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thaddeus M. Kelly, late cadet, United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin Quinn, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin Salmon, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elmer F. Malone, late of Twentieth Battery United States Field Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James Manning, late of Company E, Forty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John Bush, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christine Cook, dependent mother of Frederick H. Cook, deceased, late of Company L, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles H. Carey, late captain and assistant surgeon Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert T. Ridings, late of Battery F, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, and general service United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Beattie, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert W. Griffin, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luther S. Campbell, late of Company C, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel D. Lee, late of the Twenty-sixth Company United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Leontine M. Cremerieux, late nurse, Medical Department United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William C. Crockett, late of Company G, Second Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of William M. Simms, late of Troop L, First Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stanley W. Lemley, late of Company L, Third Battalion United States Engineers, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Leahy, dependent mother of Cornelius J. Leahy, late of Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harry E. Bryan, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Stapleton, late of Company I, Two hundred and second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mart Bradshaw, late of Company A, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to said committee:

H. R. 701. Andrew Heuser.	H. R. 7242. Howard P. Hare.
H. R. 753. James Park.	H. R. 7317. Edward P. Gallagher.
H. R. 957. Edmund S. Auld, alias Storey E. Auld.	H. R. 7453. George W. Bolling.
H. R. 996. Jeddo Q. McNatt.	H. R. 7485. Charles Schiller.
H. R. 1194. James R. Hays.	H. R. 7502. David Simpkins.
H. R. 1244. William L. Snider.	H. R. 7524. Robert Dinsmore.
H. R. 1613. Thomas J. Harris.	H. R. 7592. Hulbert O. White.
H. R. 1817. George Tuffendsam.	H. R. 7704. William Weddington.
H. R. 1925. Pauline A. Randt.	H. R. 7707. Michael Lacey.
H. R. 2210. Andrew E. Younginer.	H. R. 7723. Charles L. Johnson.
H. R. 2237. George H. McCauley.	H. R. 7878. John D. Bridgman.
H. R. 2706. Dick Parker.	H. R. 7933. George W. Craig.
H. R. 2824. Francis O. Nash.	H. R. 7975. Charles F. Spranger.
H. R. 2994. Henry W. Kappes.	H. R. 8060. William J. Shirley.
H. R. 3188. Eddy B. Stevens.	H. R. 8064. Charles L. McClure.
H. R. 3629. Arthur H. Loomis.	H. R. 8072. Richard Thrash.
H. R. 3693. Howard A. Littlejohn.	H. R. 8403. Amos H. Archer.
H. R. 3943. Pollock T. Harbold.	H. R. 8572. Franklin A. Peters.
H. R. 4008. Lemuel S. Darr.	H. R. 8578. William Lehsing.
H. R. 4089. Frank W. Allen.	H. R. 8653. Bernard Klatt.
H. R. 4275. Joseph E. Neargarder.	H. R. 8654. William F. Graham.
H. R. 4555. Wilburn Hall.	H. R. 8664. Olaf H. Heieie.
H. R. 4926. George W. Bean.	H. R. 8676. Elmer R. Harrington.
H. R. 5178. Harry Owen.	H. R. 8813. Thaddeus M. Kelly.
H. R. 5302. John Ashton.	H. R. 8907. Martin Quinn.
H. R. 5458. John T. Garrett.	H. R. 9030. Martin Salmon.
H. R. 5509. Ralph A. Finicle.	H. R. 9126. Elmer F. Malone.
H. R. 5689. Arthur J. Jerome.	H. R. 9127. James Manning.
H. R. 5785. John E. Root.	H. R. 9189. John Bush.
H. R. 5860. Pearley P. Beal.	H. R. 9334. Christine Cook.
H. R. 5884. David Mann.	H. R. 9342. Charles H. Carey.
H. R. 5898. Greene B. Caywood.	H. R. 9362. Robert T. Ridings.
H. R. 6212. Rosco Wilkins.	H. R. 9381. John Beattie.
H. R. 6222. Trigg Lewis.	H. R. 9401. Robert W. Griffin.
H. R. 6313. Joseph Harris.	H. R. 9655. Luther S. Campbell.
H. R. 6522. John F. Smoot.	H. R. 9664. Samuel D. Lee.
H. R. 6735. Carl Z. Work.	H. R. 9692. Leontine M. Cremerieux.
H. R. 6768. George M. Federkiel.	H. R. 9702. William C. Crockett.
H. R. 6770. Frank A. Pfeifferle.	H. R. 9756. William M. Simms.
H. R. 6871. Martin L. Payne.	H. R. 9803. Stanley W. Lemley.
H. R. 6897. George W. Hyland.	H. R. 9848. Mary Leahy.
H. R. 7045. Walter L. Jewell.	H. R. 9915. Harry E. Bryan.
H. R. 7056. Leo Voelker.	H. R. 10042. James Stapleton.
H. R. 7124. William V. Schwoyer.	H. R. 11020. Mart Bradshaw.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill in reference to pension bills. I notice that this is granting increase of pensions in some cases and original pensions in others to the soldiers in the Regular Army and soldiers of the Spanish War, and so on.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. DYER. Are these cases where men have applied for a pension under the general law and been rejected in each case?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Where they have made applications to the bureau for original or increase pensions, and they have been rejected.

Mr. DYER. Is it necessary that a soldier must have made application to the Pension Bureau and been rejected before the committee considers his claim?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Unless it is apparent that the soldier would not have had a pensionable status under existing law.

Mr. DYER. I want to ask the chairman of the committee about the cases of widows of the Spanish War and Philippine insurrection soldiers. In this bill I do not see a single widow provided for.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I will explain the situation. It is like this: Last fall the House, when it passed the war-risk insurance bill, increased the rate of pensions of Civil War widows and Spanish War widows to \$25 a month; that is, for those widows whose names were then on the roll and those who hereafter may be placed on the roll. That, in a large measure, disturbed the present rate that the Pension Committee had agreed upon, and before we could proceed to grant further pensions and increase of pensions to widows it was necessary for us to get in touch with the Senate Committee on Pensions and have some understanding as to the rate that the two committees would give, if possible. The chairman of the Senate committee recently died, and there being no head to that committee, it was impossible to get in touch with any member of the committee who would assume responsibility in such matters. Recently Senator Walsh, of

Montana, has been appointed chairman of that committee, and he has stated that he would appoint a subcommittee to confer with a subcommittee on pensions in the House with a view to taking up and fixing some rate that would be agreeable. That subcommittee will meet some time this week, I hope, to determine the rate, and as soon as the committee can get together and have an understanding the House committee will proceed to consider pensions for Spanish War widows and all other widows.

Mr. DYER. I am glad to hear the gentleman state that, because there are many deserving cases awaiting action. I am sure the chairman of the committee and the committee itself is doing its full duty, but there are many cases of widows of the Spanish War and of the Philippine insurrection whose applications have been rejected on some technicality in the Pension Office. Many of them are dependent, with children, and suffering to some extent, and they have not been receiving the same consideration as other war widows.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. They will receive consideration very soon.

Mr. DYER. I hope the gentleman will urge it.

The following committee amendment was agreed to:

Page 14, line 4, strike out the following: "The name of Harry E. Bryan, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving," the soldier having died.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LINTHICUM, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ARLINGTON HOTEL PROPERTY.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 262.

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 10022, entitled "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase the site and building now under construction thereon, known as the Arlington Hotel property"; that there shall be not to exceed two hours of general debate to be divided equally between those supporting and those opposing the bill; that at the conclusion of general debate the bill shall be considered under the five-minute rule for amendments, and after the bill shall have been perfected in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union the same shall be reported to the House with such amendments and recommendation as the Committee of the Whole may make, whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the bill, and all amendments thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit the bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from North Carolina will pardon me, I thought it was understood that this rule was not going to be reported. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and myself tried this morning to get in touch with the gentleman, in order to confer with him about the matter. We agreed that it was not necessary to call up this rule, and concluded that it was not necessary at this time to pass the bill to which the rule referred; that the matter could be adjusted by a simple appropriation from the Appropriation Committee reimbursing the emergency fund with the amount which the President took from such fund and expended for the purchase of the Arlington site and building. I talked with the Secretary of the Treasury a few moments ago. He had no objection to this course.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I am glad indeed to learn that from the gentleman, and very glad indeed to learn that the resolution is not necessary. The fact is, the provisions of the bill authorizing the purchase of the Arlington property will have to be changed. I got here just as quickly as I could, but was not present when the conference took place. I ask unanimous consent, if that be necessary, to withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not have to get unanimous consent. The gentleman withdraws the resolution.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Do I understand that the rule that was submitted by the gentleman from North Carolina has been withdrawn?

The SPEAKER. It has been withdrawn.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10069) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation

of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes. Pending that motion I would like to inquire if the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KENNEDY] is in the Hall?

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, Mr. KENNEDY was here a few moments ago, but he went away understanding that the other matter was coming up just submitted and withdrawn by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU]. I suggest to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] that he arrange that general debate shall proceed with the understanding that the time shall be controlled by him and Mr. KENNEDY in equal parts, postponing the fixing of the amount of time until later.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, pending the return of Mr. KENNEDY, then, I ask unanimous consent that the time of general debate be controlled one-half by myself and one-half by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KENNEDY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be controlled half and half by himself and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KENNEDY]. Is there objection?

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I trust the House will indulge me for just a moment. I hope that we shall all cut down general debate on the appropriation bills and on other bills as much as possible, not, however, to interfere with a full and fair discussion of their merits. I am confident that if the membership of the House will cooperate with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] and myself we shall be able to adjourn certainly by the 1st of July, and we hope earlier. [Applause.] Heretofore we have all had our fears in respect to the Senate; we have thought that it mattered not how early we concluded our business here, the Senate could be relied on to take its full and dignified time in concluding its business, but I am assured by Senators, and I am confident that they will make good the assurance, that if nothing unforeseen happens the Senate will be ready to adjourn as early as the House. They think Congress should be ready to adjourn not later than July 1.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. A good many requests are being made—I have had some myself as I presume others have—urging me and others to go away from here at the present time or soon to make liberty-loan speeches. Of course, I would be glad, and others would be glad, to help in every way possible in this patriotic work. Does the gentleman from North Carolina believe it would be best for Members of the House to leave their duties here at the present time or soon and go away for that purpose, or does he think it necessary for the membership to remain here?

Mr. KITCHIN. As a rule, I think it is very necessary for the membership to remain here and transact the business of the House and the necessary work of Congress. Of course, there may be exceptional individual cases here and there where a Member can safely go away for a reasonable time, and in such cases there should be no criticism of a Member leaving, but I would say generally that it is very necessary for the membership of the House to remain here.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. And if the membership does remain here important war measures can be promptly passed and the adjournment may be expedited?

Mr. KITCHIN. Not only adjournment may be expedited, but important war measures necessary to be passed will be expedited. Without knowing the urgent necessity of the early passage of some important measures, some Members have made engagements to make liberty-loan speeches. Of course, they will have to keep those engagements, and we will have to make proper arrangements for their absence. There may be and are no doubt exceptional cases, as I say, here and there, but I would say generally that the membership of the House will do a great deal better service to their country by remaining here and getting through the necessary legislation than by going away.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For some weeks the Provost Marshal has been urging the House to pass a bill which has already passed the Senate revising the draft law. An urgent meeting of the Committee on Rules was called a few days ago in respect to it, and the committee agreed on a resolution making that bill in order in the House. It was to take precedence over all other rules that had been agreed to. I thought it would have been called up on last Wednesday. Nothing has been done, however. Why has that important war measure been set aside by the River and Harbor Committee this morning?

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that my understanding from the Committee on Military Affairs is that it is not quite ready to take up this bill; but whenever the committee is ready to take it up, and that will be probably Monday, I am sure the Committee on Rivers and Harbors will give way. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] will confirm me in the statement that it was understood that the draft bill would have precedence over the river and harbor bill whenever the Military Affairs Committee was ready, even to the extent of displacing the river and harbor bill during its consideration, for such time as may be necessary for the consideration and passage of the draft bill.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Committee on Military Affairs is still waiting for some figures and statistics from the Provost Marshal General's office, which they have been delayed in furnishing.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am very glad that the gentleman, who is a prominent and active member of the Military Affairs Committee, made that statement. I do not want the House and the country to think that we are putting anything ahead of that, or any war measure.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman is not surprised that the question was raised why this committee should take precedence with this bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. I raised that question two or three days ago and went to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and he stated to me what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] has just stated.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have not quite understood the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], and I desire to propound a question. Do I understand that the reason for the delay in the consideration of the draft measure is not due to any lack of diligence on the part of the House, but of the War Department in supplying information?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; I would not say that there is any responsibility either way. I say that the War Department is doing its best to get such figures and facts as the committee desires, and the committee is doing its best to get ready to have the bill properly considered in the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then this is the fact: The War Department is doing its best—there is no criticism of that—but we are waiting upon the War Department?

Mr. MADDEN. If I may be allowed, I object to that—

Mr. KITCHIN. So far as I know, the committee is waiting on the War Department.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not want any misunderstanding. I do not think the committee is waiting for the War Department at all, but waiting for some members of the Committee on Military Affairs absent from the city to come back, and arrangements have been made that the bill would not be called up until the return of those members. I happen to know that Gen. Crowder, Provost Marshal General, has been urging early action on the new draft law, and the delay is embarrassing the War Department, and action should not be delayed longer by the House; at any rate, the blame should be placed where it belongs.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will state that the delay, even an unnecessary delay for a week or longer, will postpone the actual draft. The failure to pass the bill earlier has not embarrassed the department.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. GARNER. I want to know if I can interrogate the gentleman from Kansas in the time of the gentleman from North Carolina?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina governs that.

Mr. GARNER. That is what I am seeking recognition of the Chair for, to ask the gentleman from North Carolina if he will permit me to interrogate the gentleman from Kansas?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Kansas to have an interrogatory debate? [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, well, I reluctantly yield.

Mr. GARNER. I want to ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] whether the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois is based on facts?

Mr. ANTHONY. I did not hear the statement.

Mr. GARNER. The statement of the gentleman from Illinois was to the effect that they were not waiting for information from the War Department, but waiting on certain members of the Committee on Military Affairs to return to the city.

Mr. ANTHONY. I would say both statements are correct. It is my understanding that the committee is waiting, or, rather,

some of its members are waiting, on information to be furnished by the Provost Marshal General, and it is also true that one very efficient member of the Committee on Military Affairs, who is somewhat alarmed about the quota from his own State under the new classification, has gone to his home for the purpose of securing information as to how this new classification will work in his own State.

Mr. LONGWORTH. He has not been in Wisconsin?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not think he has been in Wisconsin.

Mr. GARNER. Do I understand the gentleman to say the entire draft law will be held up an indefinite period of time for a gentleman to go to his district to ascertain what effect it will have on his district?

Mr. ANTHONY. Oh, no; it is my opinion the whole matter will be ready in a few days; that the Provost Marshal will be able to furnish all the information desired, and members of the committee prepared to discuss intelligently some of the radical changes proposed.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Will the gentleman yield for me to put a question to the gentleman from Kansas? Would your committee be ready to proceed now if the Provost Marshal General had furnished the information?

Mr. ANTHONY. In my opinion the committee is ready to take up the bill at this minute if the House desires to do so. I do not believe this information for which some of the Members are waiting vitally affects the bill, but others believe it does. If it be the desire of the House to take it up and pass it to-day, it could be taken up.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. What—if the gentleman can state it—what is the opinion of the Provost Marshal General on that subject—that we ought to proceed without the information, or had better wait?

Mr. ANTHONY. I have not heard any intimation from him in regard to it, but individual Members think they should have certain information before proceeding, and out of deference to them, I understand, it has been held up for a few days. While undoubtedly the bill is one which should be speedily enacted into law, so that the country may know what to expect, yet it is my understanding that no draft under this new legislation is to be made in the near future, perhaps not until June, when the new quota of men who have become 21 years of age since the last registration will be called upon to register. Nearly all of these young men will go into class 1, and it is our impression that, under the authority proposed to be given, the War Department means to fill the ranks of our armies from that time on almost entirely from the men of the first classification.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. KING. Regular order!

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands regular order. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] that he control the half of the time and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KENNEDY] the other half? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair understood the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] to make some kind of a request.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I ask if I may address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. How much time?

Mr. GILLET. For two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, no Member of the House is more earnest or desirous of getting away early than I am, or will cooperate more to that end when I think such cooperation will be effective, but I have been here so long and I have heard so many of these rainbow suggestions that we could get away by the middle of June or the 1st of July and send them disappointed, that I will confess I am rather pessimistic in reference to the suggestion which the gentleman from North Carolina makes. I have not as much confidence in the power of the Senate to suppress their love for expression [laughter] as to hope that they will be ready to adjourn by the time the gentleman mentions, and, therefore, while I say I will be very glad and I am sure we will all be on this side, to cooperate toward that end, I do not think that that argument should compel us to suppress any important facts which we think it would be wise to communicate to our fellow Members here on the floor, and I do not think it ought to be used as a lever to prevent reasonable discussion.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will assure the gentleman it will not be so used.

Mr. GILLET. I did not mean to intimate any such intention.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to speak for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to call the attention of the House to the fact that those rosy predictions by me delivered during the last Congress or the last session were all verified. I made the prediction that the House could and would get through with its business before July—by June 1, if necessary—but I could not be responsible for the Senate. I wish to say now my confidence in the Senate's facilitating business has grown considerably in the last three or four months, because it has done more work, passed more legislation, from December till now than it has in the last 18 years in the same length of time. I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Gillett] that there should be full discussion on the merits of every bill considered, but I do wish the Members of the House to cut out a good deal more gas and hot air than they usually do in the long session.

Mr. MADDEN. I congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina on his power to exercise his salutary influence over the Senate. He is the first man in the House that has been able to do it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PROMOTION OF EXPORT TRADE (H. REPT. 468).

Mr. WEBB, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a conference report on the bill H. R. 2316, an act to promote export trade, and for other purposes, for printing under the rules.

ALIEN WOMEN.

Mr. WEBB, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a conference report on the bill (H. R. 9504) to amend section 4067 of the Revised Statutes by extending its scope to include women, for printing under the rules.

RIVERS AND HARBORS.

The SPEAKER. The question is on going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kennedy] is in the Hall now, and I would like to see if we can agree on the time for general debate.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I suggest that we run along during the day, and we can make an agreement this afternoon for closing debate. I have requests for about four hours on this side, and I think most of the speakers desire to speak to the bill.

Mr. SMALL. There are requests for only about two hours on this side.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Let us run on the balance of the day, and we will agree on time for general debate this evening.

The SPEAKER. The question is on going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the river and harbor bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 121, noes 8.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10069) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, with Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill, of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10069) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors present the annual river and harbor bill, and I would wish to emphasize the statement that this is an annual bill. The maintenance and improvement of rivers and harbors for navigation constitute as valuable an activity of the Government as any other. Upon their navigability depends the water transportation of the country. Water transportation is one of the instrumentalities for the movement of traffic and a most valuable factor in transportation, and any lapse in the passage of

the annual river and harbor bills means a distinct detriment to this instrumentality of transportation.

In the drafting of this bill the committee have been controlled by a well-defined policy. The bill contains appropriations for the maintenance of rivers and harbors heretofore completed. It contains, further, appropriations for the further improvement of projects which have been heretofore adopted but not completed. It further contains appropriations for a few new projects which have been adopted in the bill. Those constitute the only appropriations, except an item for examinations and surveys. A word of explanation now about the policy by which the committee has been governed.

The appropriations for maintenance and for further improvement have been primarily based upon recommendations by the Chief of Engineers, and in no instance has the committee included an appropriation above the estimates so submitted. These estimates have been formulated in the interest of economy and with due regard to war conditions. Recognizing the large demand for labor, for materials which enter into river and harbor works, the large demands upon the Treasury for exclusive war purposes, the committee deemed it proper to reduce each appropriation to the limit of wise economy; and appropriations have only been recommended for maintenance and further improvements which are necessary to maintain the organization of the War Department in the prosecution of this work.

This policy of the committee was not adopted without discussion, without incurring disappointments, but the committee believe that under all the conditions its wisdom will appear to be so obvious that it will meet with the approval of the House and the country. We hope the House will deem it wise to agree with this policy of the committee and decline to increase any appropriations in the bill.

As to new projects, the committee adopted the same policy which governed them in the formulation of the last bill; that is to say, they have recommended no projects for inclusion in this bill which were not intimately associated with the prosecution of the war and so recommended by the Secretary of War. As a matter of fact, there are only three new projects, and two of them only might be termed new projects. One is for the construction of a channel connecting Long Beach and Los Angeles Harbors, Cal., which was strongly urged upon the committee by the United States Shipping Board, growing out of shipbuilding activities, particularly at Long Beach. That carries an appropriation. Another new project is for Crescent City Harbor, Cal., which was urged upon the committee by the War Industries Board, because of the existence of chrome, a valuable mineral in the making of explosives and other war materials, and the necessity of providing facilities for transporting same. The paragraph adopting this new project for Crescent City Harbor carries no appropriation. The original report recommended the imposition of local cooperation to the extent of \$100,000, and the locality voluntarily agreed to increase that cooperation to the extent of \$200,000, which is the extent of the initial appropriation; therefore, nothing is appropriated in this bill at this time.

Another is a modification of the project for Galveston Harbor and Channel, for deepening the channel over the bar. The present depth is maintained by the construction and maintenance of jetties, but the engineers believe that an increased depth from 30 to 35 feet could be secured by dredging, and with a view to making that experiment, and if successful, thereby saving a large sum of money to the Treasury in expensive jetty construction, the committee have adopted a modification of the project in order to give an opportunity for that experiment, involving only \$65,000, which is provided for out of the existing available appropriation and therefore requires no appropriation in this bill.

In a general way I have stated the policy which controlled the committee, and it may be well now to refer to the actual appropriations, which have been made for these several purposes. The bill carries for maintenance, \$2,358,050; for maintenance and continuing improvement, \$2,642,500; for further improvements, \$14,027,350; for surveys and contingencies, \$200,000; total appropriations carried in the bill, \$19,227,900. The statement of that aggregate sum will at once impress the House with the result of the policy controlling the committee in the formulation of the bill. The bill is modest and absolutely conforms to all the necessary conditions imposed by the war.

I would like to say a word now about surveys. After mature deliberation the committee determined to omit from this bill any authorizations for examinations and surveys. In this conclusion they took into consideration these conditions.

Many of the United States Army Engineers heretofore engaged in river and harbor work have been detailed to active

military duty, and quite a number of engineer districts in the country have been placed in the charge of civilian engineers, in nearly every instance trained men who have had years of experience in the particular works in progress in such districts.

Again, there are about 150 authorizations of surveys heretofore made upon which no report has yet been submitted. I may say again that in the last bill an amendment was inserted in the House as to surveys authorized in that bill, to the effect that no survey so authorized should be made until after the close of the war with Germany, except such as the Secretary of War shall direct. So, in view of all those considerations gentlemen will understand the reason for the conclusion of the committee in determining to omit any new authorizations for examinations and surveys.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. LITTLE. I did not catch the sentence just ahead of the last one, to the effect that nothing shall be done in the way of surveys except upon suggestions or orders from the Secretary of War; but there was a statement just before that as to the ground or basis upon which that conclusion had been reached.

Mr. SMALL. There was an amendment to the last river and harbor bill, made while the bill was under consideration. There were a number of surveys in that bill, and the House thought it proper, under war conditions, that none of those surveys should be made except when specifically directed by the Secretary of War.

Mr. LITTLE. That is a statutory provision?

Mr. SMALL. Yes. It is a part of the last river and harbor act.

I think I will submit nothing further upon those features of the bill itself which involve appropriations. I will now refer to all of the general provisions in the bill which the committee thinks are important. Section 5 of the bill is intended to prohibit the unnecessary pollution of navigable streams by discharging into such streams any free acid or acid waste. The Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers made a most earnest recommendation for this provision. I shall not take the trouble to read the memorandum from the War Department upon it. It is incorporated in the report. But, in substance, it is stated that the introduction of these acids into streams not only impairs the potability of the water but destroys the fish. If it were only the pollution of the stream itself, impairing it for domestic purposes, or only the destruction of the fish, that evil might be remedied through the action of the States and municipalities. But such pollution of the water also results in deterioration of the boilers of steamboats and the hulls of vessels constructed of steel so as to reduce their life by at least one-half. In addition to that it is impairing the metallic parts of structures connected with the locks and dams so that they very rapidly deteriorate.

These two reasons affect questions which are within the jurisdiction of Congress, and it is believed that the time has come when some inhibition should be placed on industrial plants so polluting these streams. Some objection has been made to the chairman of the committee, since the bill has been reported, that it might unduly interrupt the activities of some industrial plants; but the paragraph is so framed and so flexible, placing it within the discretion of the Secretary of War as to the extent to which it would be applied, that no danger need be apprehended from that source.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption at that point?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. The district I have the honor to represent in Pennsylvania is a mining district, and for many years the mine water has been thrown into streams until it has polluted the rivers of the country there and creeks and smaller streams until they are absolutely unfit for portable purposes or for steam or domestic uses of any kind whatever. These mines, of course, have been in process of development for 50 years. It is absolutely impossible to exclude the mine water which flows by drainage into the streams, or where the water from the mines is pumped into the streams; and yet the acid from these mines, impregnating the water, has caused the effects complained of. Now, how can the law possibly be enforced against conditions of that kind? And if it can not be enforced, does the chairman of the committee think it is wise to embark upon a proposition of that kind in a river and harbor bill?

Mr. SMALL. Whether it is practicable to prohibit altogether the introduction of this free acid and acid waste into the streams is a matter on which I am not fully informed; but if the gentleman will turn to section 5 he will observe the language there,

"That, within limits to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, it shall not be lawful to throw, discharge," and so forth. It is unthinkable that the Secretary of War would take any action which would unnecessarily interrupt the activity of any mines producing coal. Of course, if it should be possible that they could avoid the discharge of this material into the rivers, they ought to be willing to yield to the conditions. But if it is impossible, or if it involves any great expense, I am very sure that in the administration of the law by the Secretary of War no condition will arise which will interfere with industry.

Mr. ROBBINS. If the gentleman will permit another observation on this point, the reason I am so deeply concerned about it is that an attempt to enforce it would have the effect of destroying the mining industry of western Pennsylvania without doubt. It is impossible to purify the water coming from those mines, impregnated with acids and impurities, and which, as the gentleman has stated, destroys all iron entering into the water and makes it even incapable of being used in the boilers on the Monongahela River and tributary streams; and I think the enforcement of such regulations here would tend to destroy the mining industry of a great part of our country, and it would be a rather dangerous thing, which I could not agree to without looking into it very carefully. Therefore I have directed the attention of the chairman of the committee to this point, to what I believe is a dangerous provision in the bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. On the point suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS], was there any testimony taken by your committee as to whether it would be practicable for the mine owners to dispose of that acid waste otherwise than by putting it into these streams?

Mr. SMALL. No; we did not. But we did inquire carefully as to whether in the enforcement of this law there would be any purpose or intent to interfere unduly with industry, and we were assured on that point.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I know there has been many times legislation here which affects great interests, as to which on the floor it has been said that the proposed legislation would be utterly impossible of enforcement, and for years its enactment was prevented. Finally, when put upon the statute books, it proved not only to be entirely practicable, but very beneficial to all concerned.

I remember that the railroad companies said it would be utterly impossible for them to put on safety appliances and many similar things which Congress required, but only after years of agitation, and I wondered whether there would not be some way in which acid could be neutralized, rather than allowed to run into the streams to kill fish and destroy other property.

Mr. SMALL. If I may simply express an opinion, I believe that a way can be found. The gentleman from Wisconsin is entirely correct in his statement that many things which have been stated to be impossible have been found to be entirely feasible and in the public interest, when we finally had the courage to enact some law upon the subject.

Mr. MERRITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. MERRITT. Has the chairman of the committee information as to whether the Secretary will promulgate general regulations, or will he consider each river and each case by itself?

Mr. SMALL. Each river on its own merits, because the industries and conditions differ.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is a regulation preventing the throwing of ashes into navigable streams.

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. As from passing vessels.

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This proposes to prevent the throwing of what becomes flotsam into a stream. Ashes sink, and by lessening the depth of channel tend to impede navigation, so that there may be a good reason for that regulation; but this material would float.

Mr. SMALL. I understand that it is soluble when discharged into the stream.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Flotsam—as, for instance, oil—and the water from a mine containing culm. The question with me is whether the inclusion of this paragraph might not interfere to a certain extent with some of the rights of States in the matter of industry. Take the Schuylkill River, for instance, where much oil oozes out into the stream in some way or other. It may pass out from the pipes or find its way into the stream

because of the method of handling. While that affects the fish life it does not necessarily impede navigation, but to penalize it might in some instances injure the business on that stream.

Mr. SMALL. I do not anticipate that the fears of the gentleman will prove to be well founded.

I might mention another injury from this pollution of the streams. The hulls of steel and iron vessels are injuriously affected, so that their owners have to exercise constant care in order to minimize deterioration; and even under the best conditions the presence of these acids makes the deterioration of metal hulls quite rapid. It therefore results in the aggregate in great loss.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We have certain State laws and regulations in Pennsylvania that forbid the pollution of streams and make it punishable. Such a law might apply to the cook on a tugboat who throws his waste material into the water. But here is a provision including a penal clause involving fine and imprisonment, and the business aspects of it merit our careful consideration.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman will understand that with a view to meeting a case where this law could not be enforced without unduly injuring some industry, in order to meet that contingency, it was left within the discretion of the Secretary of War to fix the limits within which it should be enforced, and I think there need be no fear of any unnecessary injury to industry.

Mr. SNELL. I should like to inquire of the gentleman how this would affect the large paper mills in the northern part of the country that have a large amount of waste water which it seems apparently necessary to discharge into the stream.

Mr. SWITZER. Would that water impair or injure boats or machinery?

Mr. SNELL. There are no boats and there is no machinery on these streams, but they run into navigable waters. For instance, the small streams in the northern part of New York State fall eventually either into the Hudson or the St. Lawrence. Of course, there is no navigation on the small streams where these paper mills are located.

Mr. SMALL. I would infer from the statement of the gentleman that there might be no necessity for applying the law in that case, because if there is no navigation on the stream, but the waste material finally reaches a navigable stream, by the time it reaches the larger river it may be so diffused and attenuated in the larger volume of water that the injury would be negligible.

Mr. SNELL. That is what I would like to know.

Mr. SMALL. I should think so.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does not the gentleman think it might be well to go further and provide against the pollution of streams by sewage? Here we have the great city of Washington polluting the Potomac River. In Maryland we have the great Naval Academy polluting the Severn River. It seems to me we might go further and prevent that.

Mr. SMALL. As I tried to say in the beginning of my remarks on this paragraph, if the only injury to these streams consisted of results outside of the jurisdiction of Congress, the committee would probably have not presented this paragraph, but the pollution of streams by sewage is largely a matter for State and municipal correction.

Mr. LINTHICUM. How can the State regulate it? Maryland and Virginia own both sides of the Potomac, except these 10 miles here in the District of Columbia, where a great amount of sewage is dumped in. How can the States control that? It is an absolute impossibility.

Mr. SMALL. It is true that in the case of a river constituting the boundary line between States that Congress might assume jurisdiction and prohibit acts which polluted navigable streams, even if such pollution did not directly affect navigation.

Mr. LINTHICUM. We could not control it in Annapolis.

Mr. SMALL. The pollution of streams through the discharge of sewage usually occurs in smaller rivers.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. SWITZER. If I understand the provision in the bill, the Secretary of War would not make any regulations unless the pollution resulted in the product of acid water that would interfere with navigation or had some deteriorating effect on the material entering into the construction of boilers and material entering into the construction of locks and dams. It would not matter what the pollution consisted of unless it produced an acid water.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. Section 5 uses this expression, "free acid or acid waste in any form." There is nothing in the bill defining what that means or what it embraces, or what the effect of it will be as referred to in debate. What does the chairman of the committee understand to be meant to be included in the term "free acid or acid waste"?

Mr. SMALL. I can only answer that by the statement that the committee were informed that those terms had a well known meaning in chemistry and that there would be no ambiguity by the use of the words.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. SMALL. Gladly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In reply to the gentleman from Alabama, my understanding is that free acid would mean acid uncombined, practically pure acid. It would not be entirely so, but we speak of free oxygen which is oxygen uncombined, and free acid would be practically pure; that is, the major part of it would be acid. But acid waste I should construe to mean water flowing away from a mine, for instance, mixed with acid.

Mr. SMALL. I think the gentleman is right both as to free acid and acid waste.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman would apply the acid test.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I was not referring to the acid test.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Are the estimates upon which the appropriations provided for in this measure based on the report of the Chief Engineer's office of the War Department as in the past?

Mr. SMALL. They were, and no appropriation in the bill exceeds the estimate so submitted.

Mr. WALSH. What has become of the provision providing for a water commission? Did that become a law in the last bill?

Mr. SMALL. Yes; but the President has never yet appointed the commission.

Mr. WALSH. That important body which it was urged was the most important during the war emergency has not been appointed by the Executive?

Mr. SMALL. I confess to the impeachment. We were informed by those who advocated it, not by the President as I recall, but by many others, that it was a most important provision and ought to be inserted in the bill forthwith.

Mr. WALSH. I recall the argument, but my question was prompted by curiosity to know whether this board had cooperated in any way in preparing the estimates or outlining the program to be carried on under the appropriations in this bill. Of course, if the commission has not been appointed that answers the question.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMALL. I will.

Mr. ALMON. The gentleman has stated that there were no public hearings in regard to section 5, and that the industries of the country have not been heard from as to how they would be affected by that section. The gentleman has also stated that he has assurances that the regulation and enforcement of this provision would be in such a manner as not to affect unduly public industries. From what source did the gentleman receive that assurance, and is it in writing?

Mr. SMALL. The assurance was received from the Secretary of War. That was oral, but I think the assurance is contained in the hearings on the bill, which are printed and accessible.

In order that we may hurry along on the paragraph, I want to give as an additional reason why the fears of Members may be unfounded that the Du Pont powder people through their representative called on the chairman of the committee and said that with this provision in the bill they could not operate their plant, but when I referred them to the language of the paragraph and advised them to go and see the Chief of Engineers about the matter I heard nothing more about it. One or two representatives of paper mills mentioned the matter to me, and when I pointed out the language in the paragraph and referred them also to the Chief of Engineers nothing more was heard from them. So it would appear that on investigation the gentlemen who made the complaint were satisfied, and I think it is fair to deduce that as a reason why the provision will not do unnecessary injury to business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Before the gentleman leaves that section, I notice the bill carries no appropriation for continuing the work of canalization of the Cumberland River below Nashville. The hearings seem to indicate that Col. Newcomer felt that the

available funds were sufficient for the coming year. Does the gentleman know whether this work is to be continued without being stopped on the locks now under construction, and that available funds are sufficient for that purpose?

Mr. SMALL. The balance available on July 1, 1917, for the Cumberland River below Nashville was \$1,243,140.02. As to the manner in which this will be applied I refer the gentleman to the last annual report of the Chief of Engineers for 1917, pages 1200 and 1201, particularly the paragraphs entitled "Condition at end of fiscal year" and "Proposed operations." The existing project provides for the construction of Locks and Dams A, B, C, D, E, and F, beginning with Lock A, 41 miles below Nashville, and ending at Lock F, a distance of 43.6 miles above the mouth of the river and open channel work below Lock F. The minimum project depth is 6 feet. Lock A was completed in 1904. With the available balance it is proposed to complete Locks and Dams B, C, D, E, and F.

Section 6 provides that whenever the Secretary of War is authorized to acquire land by condemnation the United States, upon the filing of the petition, shall have the right to take immediate possession. That is a matter of great importance. Quite often public works or improvements are held up for one, two, and three years awaiting the conclusion of litigation arising out of the condemnation proceedings, this delay being brought about through appeals and other incidental causes, and this paragraph is intended to give the Government the right to take immediate possession. But that right is surrounded with provisions for the protection of the property owner. For instance, before the Government can take possession there must have been an appropriation made, or if the right of way or property are to be provided by local interests and title made to the United States then they are to give a bond to meet such award as may be finally adjudicated. This paragraph if enacted into law will prevent these unnecessary delays and at the same time throw every protection around the property of the citizen and is a very essential provision.

Section 7 permits juries in making awards under condemnation proceedings to take into consideration special benefits. That is to say, if the Government takes half of a tract of land and, as a matter of fact, the remaining half is enhanced by reason of this public improvement, that benefit or enhancement in value shall be considered in making the award of just compensation to the owner of the land. The committee has given careful consideration to this provision. It is a question that has been several times discussed by the Supreme Court of the United States, and they hold in general terms that in ascertaining what is just compensation under the provision of the United States Constitution it is allowable to take special benefits into consideration in making the award. But in one or two districts of the United States, if not more, courts have held that special benefits could not be taken into consideration unless there was a statutory provision to that effect, and in some States the courts have held likewise, so that in order to remove that question from all doubt and to translate into law what has been already said, by the Supreme Court ought to be considered in arriving at the just compensation to be awarded to the landowner, the committee have deemed it wise to prepare and submit this paragraph for your consideration.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I highly approve the action of the committee in this respect, which I think is very necessary and proper. As the gentleman has stated, I know it has been a subject of consideration before his committee. Under the statutes enacted in the past that have come from his committee there is more occasion to use such a provision probably than anywhere else in connection with Government action. I take it that what has developed this action, as the gentleman stated, is that in a number of States, as in my own, the rule is not applied. The rule applied there, I think, is all wrong, unjust, inequitable, and particularly so at a time like this. It is very unjust that a man who is getting benefits out of the action of the Government should not make any allowance for it when his property is taken.

Mr. SMALL. In some instances the property not taken has so increased in value as to have a market value in excess of the value of the whole tract prior to the expropriation of a part by the Government and the completion of the improvement, and it would be unjust not to take such special benefits into consideration in making the award.

Section 8 directs the Chief of Engineers hereafter in his annual report to indicate in a general way the terminal and transfer facilities existing at every city located upon a harbor or stream under improvement by the United States, and directs

him to make from time to time special reports upon the existence of terminal and transfer facilities. That is as we believe an exceedingly wise provision and is constructive in character. As I shall refer to that briefly later, I shall not take more time now.

And I wish in conclusion to direct the attention of the committee to a brief consideration of the broad question of water transportation. It is unnecessary to consume the time of the committee in emphasizing the value of transportation by water. We have substantially three modes of transport—the highway, the railway, and the waterway. They are all important, and they all are or should be coordinate. Each one should be a unit in the general system of transportation of the country. For instance, a very distinct movement is in progress at this time toward the larger use of motor cars in the movement of traffic upon our highways, and if we could have represented in tonnage the amount that is now moved annually upon the highways of this country in motor trucks, I doubt not all of us would be astonished. Likewise, waterways are simply one of the coordinate units in our system of transportation. It is useless to take up the time of the committee also in giving expression to the need of water transportation, particularly in this acute period of congestion of traffic. I take it that there will not be a dissent to the proposition that water transportation is valuable and that any legislation or activity which promotes transportation by water is distinctly in the public interest.

In these annual river and harbor appropriation bills we endeavor to improve harbors and channels so as to make them more navigable and more easily usable for the purposes of transportation, but the difficulty in the past has been that we, the Congress of the United States and the American public, have been content to rest upon the statement that channels ought to be provided, and we have forgotten the concurrent proposition that channels alone do not produce water commerce. I have attended, as you have, organizations intended to promote the improvement of channels throughout the country for navigation, and I have heard emphasized many times the importance of larger appropriations for the purpose of improving these channels, but very seldom have I heard any advocacy of the other activities needed in developing water transportation. As a matter of fact, deeper and better channels, while a necessity for water transportation, are only the primary essential. Other things must be considered. I desire to present to you just briefly some of these other things. Of course we must have water transportation lines. These lines must have ample capital; they must have the type of boat appropriate to the particular navigation to be engaged in; they must be organized and operated under business and traffic management in a manner substantially analogous to the railroads. But even that is not all, because some of us have seen water transportation lines upon navigable rivers go out of use and be abandoned and water commerce decline when there was a navigable channel and when also there were transportation lines.

What is another need? There must be water terminals. It is impossible to maintain water transportation profitably without these. Terminals are as essential for navigable channels as are terminals for railroads. The uses of these terminals are primarily for transfer and for storage of freight, but more largely to afford better facilities for transfer. These terminals should be located upon ample areas; they should have capacious warehouses; they should be appropriately located upon a river and harbor accessible to shippers and the main highways and railroads. There must be good highways leading from the water terminal to the general system of highways of the community and section. Further, the water terminal should be connected with all the railroads serving the community by one or two belt lines, and all of this improvement under the general name of a water terminal should be owned by the public and regulated in the interests of the public.

It is astonishing when one comes to study the navigable waterways of the country to learn to what extent the providing of these adequate water terminals has been neglected. Let me give you an illustration. The committee determined early at the beginning of this session that they would lay down a constructive policy and endeavor, in so far as practicable and within reasonable limits, to confine appropriations for the improvement of waterways to those where the contiguous communities and localities, which means primarily the cities and towns, would give satisfactory assurance that they would provide water terminals. May I illustrate? In 1910 we adopted an expensive project for the improvement of the Ohio River, involving the construction of 54 locks and dams, with a view of providing 9 feet of water the year round under all stages of water, at a total cost of more than \$60,000,000, and we have appropriated, including the appropriation in this bill, a little more than half of the money for

the construction of that great improvement. I would not say a word to disparage the importance of this improvement, but I would submit this proposition and stand upon it. We may complete that improvement of the Ohio River, we may give them 9 feet the year round, and unless the cities and towns contiguous to the Ohio River provide terminals there will not be developed upon that river a commerce commensurate with the expenditure for the improvement. [Applause.] And the Congress of the United States can not afford to expend public money unless we are going to get value received. We took up the matter of terminals upon the Ohio River. The committee addressed letters to the mayors of every city and town and the secretaries of every commercial organization, inquiring what kind of terminals they had and if they did not have any what they proposed to do, and told them unless we had satisfactory assurance when we came to formulate the next bill the committee would seriously consider abandoning this improvement.

We received letters varying in tenor and, I am glad to say, generally satisfactory; and that correspondence, which is continuing, indicates a status of public opinion in the cities and towns along the Ohio River which will result in these water terminals at every appropriate point. But some of them insisted, and among them some intelligent men, contended that all the cities and towns had adequate terminals already. We addressed a letter to the Chief of Engineers, asking him to direct some district engineer to investigate the condition of the terminals along the Ohio from Pittsburgh to Cairo, and he made a report stating that there was not a single water terminal on the river which would answer the purposes of a terminal to meet the needs of water transportation. I mention that as a condition not alone affecting the Ohio River, but as affecting other rivers of the country, and I believe I can state as the consensus of the opinion of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors—certainly it expresses my attitude—that the committee hereafter will consider whether localities contiguous to streams to be improved are going to do their part in order to promote transportation before we made appropriations for the improvement of those streams. [Applause.]

There is another essential in the development of water transportation, and that is interchange of traffic between the water carriers and the railroads. Now, however essential water terminals may be for local traffic—that is to say, water traffic which is initiated at a water point and has its destination at a water point—interchange of traffic between water carriers and railroads is impossible without these water terminals.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Speaking of water terminals, it is true, is it not, that it may be very difficult for some cities, without a very great expenditure, to secure adequate water terminal facilities because of the fact that the railroads have seen to it that they—the railroads—have gotten all the property that can be used for terminals?

Mr. SMALL. That is unfortunately true in some cities on rivers, and particularly on some harbors.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Take East St. Louis. Has not the Wiggins Ferry Co. obtained a monopoly of the water front there?

Mr. SMALL. I am not sufficiently familiar with conditions there to state whether such a monopoly exists.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is practically that.

Mr. SMALL. But I have in mind several cities where the railroads own most of the available water front. In this connection I may state this proposition: When a railroad owns water front which it has purchased in the past for the purpose of establishing a monopoly, and all of that water front is not needed for its own traffic purposes, it is within the power of the sovereign by appropriate legislation to condemn and take that property for the benefit of the public, just as it could take it from an individual, and any State or any city may rest assured that it need not be deterred from securing adequate front for terminal facilities by reason of the existence of such conditions. But, coming back to the question of the interchange of traffic, it is impossible to interchange traffic between railroads and the waterways unless you have these terminals and transfer facilities.

For instance, by way of illustration, an adequate terminal should have between the warehouse and the bulkhead on the water at least two railroad tracks. Those railroad tracks would connect with the belt line on which cars may be moved loaded with products to be transferred to a boat or with products which have been transferred from a boat and intended to be moved into the interior by rail. Such rail tracks which are an immediate part of the terminal would be located between

the bulkhead where the boat is moored and the warehouse. A properly equipped terminal, with its movable power crane, could pick up the freight from the water carrier quickly and load it immediately into the cars, in order that it might be transported further by rail, or likewise transfer it into the warehouse. One of the purposes of a terminal is to enable this transfer to be made in the cheapest and quickest manner. Why, it is true at some particular landings in cities on the Mississippi River, for instance, that it actually costs as much to get freight out of the water carrier onto the elevation constituting the bank of the river and transport the same a mile to the consignee as it costs to transport it a hundred or more miles by water carrier on the river itself. And the water terminal removes that obstacle and reduces the cost of transfer to a minimum.

The Panama Canal act, passed in 1912, contains provisions which enable any water transportation line or any municipality to apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission to have a prorating system adopted between the boat lines and all the railroads, have joint rates fixed, and to compel physical connection between the terminal and the railroads. Although this act has been in existence more than seven years it has been enforced in only a few instances. The shippers in cities and towns along navigable waterways should be advised as to their rights in securing joint traffic arrangements between the boat lines and the railroads.

There is one other essential for the establishment of a sane system of water transportation growing out of the vicious idea which prevailed for many years in the past, that the waterways were competitors of the railroads, and, therefore, that water-transportation lines were to be destroyed in the interest of the railroads. In the past, particularly from 1870 to 1900, many railroads were constructed paralleling navigable rivers. During this period they reduced rail rates competitive with water and generally so low as to render the operation of boat lines unprofitable. This resulted usually in the ultimate abandonment of the boat lines. In some instances the railroads purchased the boat lines and later, upon one pretext or another, withdrew the boat lines from operation. The result has been that upon many of the rivers of the country, particularly on the rivers of the Mississippi Valley, water commerce of prior years, which had existed in large volume, has gradually diminished to such an extent as to be incomparable to the volume of former years.

What is the remedy for this condition? It is my individual opinion that no good ground can be found for a lower rate by rail competitive with water than a rate into the interior. It costs the railroad as much. There is no difference in that respect. And the only justification which can be furnished is to give the railroad a monopoly of the traffic of all that section, a reasonable amount of which would under normal conditions go by water, or to destroy transportation altogether upon the waterways. I believe upon every principle of economics and of transportation that no good reason can be found for a lower rail rate competitive with water than prevails under the same condition for railroads serving an interior section. But whether that proposition is well founded or not, there can be absolutely no reason furnished why there should not be a readjustment of rail rates competitive with water, so as to afford a sufficient differential in favor of water lines, in order that they may be established and operated for the benefit of the public. [Applause.]

I have with the concurrence of the committee taken up this question with the President, who, I may say, is in sympathy with it, with the Director General of Railroads, and also with the Committee on Inland Water Transportation, appointed by the Director General of Railroads. And I hope and believe that they will take some action which will result in a readjustment of these rail rates, so that this unnecessary obstacle to the development of water transportation upon our rivers shall be removed; and if it shall transpire that the railroad act which was recently passed by Congress does not give the Director General and the President sufficient power to so readjust these rates in the interest of water transportation, Congress ought to make any further amendment to the law which may be essential to that end.

I have consumed much more time of the committee than I had intended, but—

Mr. LONERGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. LONERGAN. I would like to ask a specific question here.

On page 2, line 15, of the bill, I notice a provision for an appropriation of \$15,000 for maintenance of the Connecticut River below Hartford. In the last bill, if my memory serves me, there was an appropriation of approximately \$71,000 or \$72,000.

Will that represent part of an appropriation to be made in the future to carry out improvements recommended by the Board of Engineers of the War Department?

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman will remember that for the Connecticut River above Hartford there is a new project, and a most important one, which we hope some day will be adopted. It involves the development of a very large and valuable volume of hydroelectric energy. But you are speaking now of the Lower Connecticut, below Hartford?

Mr. LONERGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMALL. The available balance for the present fiscal year there was \$70,204, and that, with the appropriation carried in the bill, which I think is \$15,000, was regarded as sufficient for the maintenance of that project during the remainder of this fiscal year and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919. But I will remind the gentleman that there is also a new project for the Connecticut River below Hartford, a modification of the existing project, so as to provide for additional dikes, retaining walls, revetments, and accessory works at an estimated cost of \$211,000. The committee under its policy did not see its way to adopting that modification in the present bill.

Mr. LONERGAN. Can the gentleman state the amount that will be necessary to carry out the work where \$70,000 has already been appropriated? Is it not approximately \$281,000 or \$282,000?

Mr. SMALL. If the gentleman is assuming that the existing project has not been completed, I would suggest he is in error in that. The existing project for the Connecticut River below Hartford has been substantially completed, and it is only now a question of maintenance until we adopt the modification of the project on which a favorable report has been submitted. I would not, I think, make an improper statement if I said that in good time, inasmuch as the modification of that project is so meritorious, it will receive the approval of the committee.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. HICKS. On page 2, commencing at line 18, a number of items are mentioned—some 13 altogether—and for the maintenance of these the amount given is \$22,000. Now, I assume that as all these different harbors and breakwaters are mentioned, part of \$22,000 at least must be used to cover each individual item. It strikes me that there must be some very small items to have \$22,000 divided up among 13 propositions.

Mr. SMALL. I will say to the gentleman that for many years—25 years or more—certain projects under improvement have been grouped, usually projects within a given area, and always projects within a given engineer district, and grouped for this primary purpose: While appropriations for maintenance or further improvement might be recommended only for a part of them, yet the value of grouping lay in this, that if by reason of any unforeseen contingency, such as storm or flood, any of those projects which did not seem to require any appropriation at the time of the submission of the report of the engineers or at the time of the enactment of the law, might require improvement or restoration on account of these subsequent events, the Chief of Engineers could divert a part of the gross appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. HICKS. Then I understand that some of these items will not receive any of this money this year?

Mr. SMALL. Duck Island, Branford, New Haven, Milford, Bridgeport, Southport, Norwalk, Five Mile River, Stamford, and so forth—is that the paragraph?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. In that group the only items for which an estimate was submitted were New Haven Harbor, \$14,000, and Housatonic River, Conn., \$8,000.

Mr. HICKS. A number of them are in my district, and I was wondering what was being done there.

Mr. SMALL. I might refer the gentleman to section 2 of the bill, on page 16, where he will find the law controlling the application of funds for consolidated or grouped items.

Mr. HICKS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I would like to say this in conclusion: The river and harbor bill has been an object of attack by some citizens of the country and by some of the press and by some Representatives in this body. These criticisms have never been wholly justified. There have been defects in river and harbor bills, just as there are in every other large appropriation bill submitted to this House. There have been some errors, there have been some items subject to criticism, certainly from the viewpoint of the critic; but whatever grounds of criticism there have been against river and harbor bills in the past have been due to the fact that by reason of our own inertia and that of the public we have made appropria-

tions simply for improving channels in rivers and harbors and for the construction of canals, without at the same time adopting a constructive policy which would result in the promotion and establishment of water transportation upon those channels and in those harbors so improved.

I admit, and the membership of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors admit, that we have made appropriations perhaps in the past for some rivers where the commerce did not seem to justify the appropriations, but many of them are great rivers.

Take the upper Mississippi River, if you please, which has been a target for criticism, or the lower Mississippi as well. There ought to be a large commerce upon that river. What is the duty of our committee and of Congress in that regard? To abandon it in the face of the need of additional facilities for transportation, or to adopt a policy which will result in the establishment of water transportation upon that great river?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Has any policy been established with reference to that, with respect to barges and things of that kind, by the Government?

Mr. SMALL. I may say that the Shipping Board has allotted a fund of \$3,360,000, as I recall, for the construction of 24 barges and 4 towboats, to be operated between St. Louis and Minneapolis.

Mr. DYER. I am glad to have the gentleman state that, and I am sure it will result in great work in that section, and it will be an answer forever to those who have been criticizing what has been done in the past with reference to the Mississippi River.

Mr. SMALL. Let us hope so. I submit that the correct policy of this committee and the correct policy of Congress, instead of abandoning a navigable river, is to adopt a constructive policy which will establish water transportation upon that river, and so act in the public interest. That is what your committee have attempted to do.

Let me give you an illustration, and I will only advert to it for a moment, to show the importance of terminals for water transportation. Last fall Mr. Goltra and perhaps other gentlemen evolved a plan for the purpose of demonstrating the availability of the upper Mississippi River from Minneapolis to St. Louis for water transportation. Not as a gratuity, but for a valuable consideration, they secured some barges and a towboat from the War Department. They carried coal to Minneapolis and transported down the river iron ore. When they reached Minneapolis they had to wait a week or two until some temporary appliances and facilities could be constructed before they could unload that cargo and take on a cargo, and by reason of the absence of terminal facilities at Minneapolis and St. Paul the profit which they otherwise would have made upon that trip was consumed in the ensuing delay and in the additional cost involved in the transfer of the traffic to and from the barges. That is an illustration of the great value and necessity of terminals for water transportation.

In conclusion, let me say that while these criticisms have been indulged in, let us adopt a better policy, and instead of criticizing the projects themselves let us bring about the conditions under which there will be water transportation upon all these streams, and justify them, and also at the same time benefit the country.

Let me say as to this particular bill that it is immune from criticism. Criticize it if you can or will. We are prepared to meet any criticism from the membership of the House, from the press, or from the public at large. We have a bill which has been formulated along the lines of the policy which I have endeavored to explain to the House. We submit it as a bill which is entitled to the approbation and to the support of the House, and as one which is distinctly in the public interest. [Applause.]

By leave of the House I extend my remarks so as to embrace certain additional information.

According to a preliminary report of the Census Bureau on "Water Transportation in 1916," it appears that 376,000,000 tons of freight were carried on the waterways of the United States in 1916. This traffic would fill 9,400,000 average 40-ton freight cars, or about four times as many cars as are owned by the railroads of the United States.

There has been discussion from time to time regarding the depths of channels which should be provided for some of the principal harbors of the United States. Naturally conditions differentiate some harbors from others. For instance, San Francisco and Seattle possess such natural depth in their harbors that no improvements have been required other than the removal of a few obstructions at San Francisco. In some harbors which have a large commerce, but which naturally had restricted depths, the providing and maintenance of deeper

channels has been quite expensive. It will be impracticable to provide an equal depth for all the important harbors either on the Atlantic, the Gulf, or Pacific coasts. Nor does it seem essential that every harbor should be placed on a parity as to depth of channel or other navigation facilities. New York is the only great harbor for which a depth of 40 feet has been provided, and above the upper bay a channel of this depth only exists in the Hudson River. While the trend in ship construction has been toward larger hulls and greater carrying capacity, yet the great bulk of our foreign trade is carried in ships with a loaded draft of less than 30 feet, and a very large proportion with a loaded draft of less than 26 feet. I have been unable to secure the draft of vessels engaged in the coastwise trade arriving or departing from our ports, but I have secured, through the Chief of Engineers, information as to the draft of vessels for a certain period arriving at and departing from New York and a list of vessels departing from Galveston, all in the foreign trade.

Statement of the combined number and draft of vessels arriving at and departing from New York Harbor from January 1 to June 30, 1914. (Compiled from Pilots' Records.) Note that coastwise vessels are not included:

Draft of vessels.	
ARRIVALS OR DEPARTURES.	
12 feet and less than 13 feet	152
13 feet and less than 14 feet	188
14 feet and less than 15 feet	232
15 feet and less than 16 feet	213
16 feet and less than 17 feet	185
17 feet and less than 18 feet	270
18 feet and less than 19 feet	332
19 feet and less than 20 feet	321
20 feet and less than 21 feet	282
21 feet and less than 22 feet	350
22 feet and less than 23 feet	251
23 feet and less than 24 feet	294
24 feet and less than 25 feet	230
25 feet and less than 26 feet	230
26 feet and less than 27 feet	172
27 feet and less than 28 feet	138
28 feet and less than 29 feet	147
29 feet and less than 30 feet	78
30 feet and less than 31 feet	50
31 feet and less than 32 feet	28
32 feet and less than 33 feet	44
33 feet and less than 34 feet	21
34 feet and less than 35 feet	5
35 feet and less than 36 feet	10
36 feet and less than 37 feet	8
37 feet and less than 38 feet	4
38 feet and over	5
Total	4,340

It will be observed that the above table covers the period from January 1 to June 30, 1914, just prior to the European war, which probably represented the normal period of commerce. The total number of boats arriving and departing drawing 35 feet and over was only 27, or six-tenths of 1 per cent out of the total number, 4,340. The total number of boats having a loaded draft of 30 feet and over was 175, or 4 per cent, of the total number. The total number of boats having a loaded draft of 25 feet and over was 940, or 21.7 per cent of the total number.

I now append a table giving the number and draft of vessels departing from Galveston in the foreign trade for the calendar year 1916:

Statement of the number and draft of vessels departing from Galveston, Tex., to foreign ports for the year 1916 (coastwise vessels not included):

Draft of vessels.		Number.
11 feet and less than 12 feet		1
12 feet and less than 13 feet		2
13 feet and less than 14 feet		3
14 feet and less than 15 feet		3
15 feet and less than 16 feet		19
16 feet and less than 17 feet		6
17 feet and less than 18 feet		22
18 feet and less than 19 feet		38
19 feet and less than 20 feet		29
20 feet and less than 21 feet		25
21 feet and less than 22 feet		57
22 feet and less than 23 feet		54
23 feet and less than 24 feet		51
24 feet and less than 25 feet		42
25 feet and less than 26 feet		33
26 feet and less than 27 feet		18
27 feet and less than 28 feet		11
28 feet and less than 29 feet		7
29 feet and less than 30 feet		3
Total departures		424

Many of the vessels in the above table arrived and departed several times during the year. Information is not available as to whether or not each vessel was fully loaded.

The total number of boats departing drawing 25 feet and over was 72, or 17 per cent of the total number—424. The total number of boats departing drawing over 20 feet was 301, or 71 per cent of the total number.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Fordney	Kelly, Pa.	Robinson
Austin	Foss	Kiess, Pa.	Rogers
Bankhead	Fuller, Ill.	King	Rose
Blackmon	Gallagher	Kitchin	Rowe
Borland	Gallivan	Knutsen	Rowland
Brodbeck	Gandy	Kreider	Rucker
Browning	Garland	LaGuardia	Sanders, N. Y.
Brumbaugh	Garrett, Tenn.	Langley	Saunders, Va.
Burnett	Garrett, Tex.	Larsen	Scott, Iowa
Campbell, Pa.	Good	Lehbach	Scott, Mich.
Cannon	Goodwin, Ark.	Lenroot	Scott, Pa.
Carew	Gordon	Lever	Scully
Carter, Okla.	Graham, Pa.	Lobeck	Sells
Chandler, N. Y.	Gray, Ala.	Longworth	Shallenberger
Classon	Greene, Vt.	McAndrews	Siegel
Costello	Griest	McClintic	Slemp
Crosser	Griffin	McCormick	Smith, Mich.
Currie, Mich.	Hamill	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, T. F.
Curry, Cal.	Hamilton, N. Y.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Snyder
Darrow	Hamlin	McLemore	Stafford
Davidson	Harrison, Miss.	Maher	Stedman
Davis	Haskell	Mann	Steele
Decker	Haugen	Meeker	Stevenson
Delaney	Hayes	Mondell	Stiness
Denison	Heintz	Moon	Sullivan
Dies	Helvering	Morgan	Swift
Donovan	Hensley	Morin	Talbott
Dooling	Hollingsworth	Mudd	Taylor, Colo.
Doughton	Hood	Norton	Templeton
Drukker	Howard	Oliver, N. Y.	Thomas
Dunn	Husted	Olney	Tilson
Eagan	Hutchinson	Parker, N. Y.	Tinkham
Edmonds	Ireland	Porter	Towner
Estopinal	Johnson, S. Dak.	Powers	Vare
Fairchild, B. L.	Johnson, Wash.	Ragsdale	Venable
Fairchild, G. W.	Jones, Va.	Ramsey	Vestal
Fess	Juul	Rayburn	
Flynn	Kelley, Mich.	Riordan	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the river and harbor appropriation bill, H. R. 10069, and finding itself without a quorum, he had caused the roll to be called, whereupon 282 Members, a quorum, answered to their names, and he presented the names of the absentees to be printed in the Journal and Record.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the newspapers on yesterday contained an item stating that the President, on the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, had taken \$4,200,000 out of the \$100,000,000 emergency war fund placed in the President's hands by Congress to purchase the Arlington Hotel property. The newspapers by the publication of this item do both the President and the Secretary of the Treasury a great injustice. The Secretary of the Treasury has not asked the President to take \$4,200,000, or any other sum, out of an emergency war fund for any such purpose. The Secretary of the Treasury has a high sense of responsibility for the position he holds and for the manner in which the public funds are expended. Therefore he would not ask the President of the United States to violate the spirit of the law under which the \$100,000,000 had been placed in the President's hands by taking out of that sum \$4,200,000, or any other amount, for any other purpose than that for which it was placed in the hands of the President. So I say the newspapers have done both the President and the Secretary of the Treasury great injustice.

Mr. Chairman, it would require most convincing proof to establish the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury would think of asking the President to divert moneys from an emergency war fund for the purposes indicated. The Secretary of the Treasury has too high a regard for the President and too high a regard for the oath of office that the President has taken, and too high a regard for the oath of office that he himself has taken, to think of making such a request as the newspapers charge that he made of the President. It is inconceivable that the Secretary of the Treasury would think of making such a request of the President. I do not understand how the press of the country, that usually has been friendly to the President and to the administration, could think of publishing such a statement.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I would rather proceed for a time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman's argument is very interesting, but I think there is some ground for the statement of the newspapers.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I would require most convincing proof. It would require the verbal statement of the President that he had been requested by the Secretary of the Treasury, an admission by the Secretary of the Treasury that he had made the request, or in lieu of that a confirmation of the deal that the newspapers allege was the result of the request of the Secretary of the Treasury and the grant of the request by the President. If the Arlington Hotel property has been purchased and the deal is consummated, that, of course, will be convincing evidence; but until that proof is forthcoming hearsay testimony is not convincing. I would doubt the authenticity of a copy of a letter alleged to have been written by the President bearing his signature. I would doubt any sort of evidence except direct evidence of the fact.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman if the Rules Committee had information before them that this deal had been consummated?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. They had not. The Rules Committee have not had any such evidence or admission.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is aware of the fact that a bill was to have been called up this morning—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I wish the gentleman from Pennsylvania would allow me to proceed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Very well.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have stated that it would require the most convincing evidence that the Secretary of the Treasury would make these astounding requests of the President. I do not believe they have been made. It is stated in the same article that the requests were made by the Secretary of the Treasury because the necessities of the Treasury for additional room really amounted to a war emergency. That can not be true, because it is not true. I stated that it could not be true that the Secretary of the Treasury had made these requests of the President or the statement that it was a war emergency. First of all, it is not a war emergency. The building in question is not a war necessity. Recently under an authorization from the Congress we have repaired and altered many buildings south of Pennsylvania Avenue belonging to the Government, which will house many hundreds of Government employees. We are building acres upon acres of public buildings in which to house the employees of the Government.

Mr. GLASS. Will the gentleman submit to an interruption?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I would rather not at this time. We are appropriating millions and hundreds of millions of dollars for the construction of office buildings throughout the city. In addition to that, more than half a year ago the Secretary of the Treasury asked authorization for the construction of an annex to the Treasury on the Belasco Theater site. That authorization was granted on the 27th of September last. It was stated when the authorization was asked for that, if it was made, the building would immediately be thrown up there to relieve the necessities of the Treasury; that it was imperative that the authorization be made. The Committee on Rules made a bill in order, and the authorization for the expenditure of \$1,200,000 for building a Treasury annex on the site south of the Belasco Theater was passed. That was the 27th of September—more than six months ago. So far only discussion and working on plans have been done toward the erection of that building.

If there had been an immediate necessity for office room to relieve the congested condition in the Treasury, the Secretary of the Treasury would have rushed the construction of the Treasury annex under the authorization and the appropriation that he has. That has not been done, and, of course, it has not been done because the necessities of the Treasury did not require it.

Further, there is ample space for one of the bureaus in the Treasury Department in the Bureau of Pensions—that of allotment to soldiers' relatives. I have it on the very highest authority that the Pension Commissioner can handle with the force he now has the allotments to the relatives of soldiers in the cantonments and at the front. That would relieve the congested condition in the Treasury to a large extent. The matters to be dealt with are so peculiarly within the work of the Pension Bureau that it should be done there, and at a time when money is so much in need for war purposes, so difficult to secure, every advantage should be taken of economy in the employment of men and in the utilization of space.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I would rather not at this moment. Every effort should be made, therefore, to economize for the one purpose of conserving the resources of the Nation in order to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion. There-

fore advantage should be taken by the administration of the opportunity to handle the war allotment out of the Pension Office.

Further, a building is now being constructed between Eighteenth and Nineteenth Streets, up near the Interior Department Building. It is an eight-story building, with over 800 rooms, which will accommodate all the office force that could possibly be required for the work that is being done in the Treasury Department. This building is available for the Secretary of the Treasury; it will be completed in a few days, and is ready now for any such preparation as might be required in order to make it suitable for the needs of the Treasury.

So I say, for all of these reasons it could not be possible that the Secretary of the Treasury has made such an astounding request on the President of the United States as a war measure. I repeat, I do not believe that the Secretary has made such a request.

So far I have confined my observations on this subject to the Secretary of the Treasury. I now address myself to the President of the United States. That great office, towering above all other in the world to-day, occupied by a man fitted by education and training for the high station, would never think of violating a sacred fund placed in his hands to accomplish purposes secretly, wisely, and efficiently in preparing this country for war, to the consummation of a real estate transaction of this character. The President of the United States has a high appreciation of the duties and responsibilities of his office, and would never think of diverting a fund that was placed in his hands to prepare the Nation for war to erect or buy a public building, complying in all respects to the tests of the Fine Arts Commission, containing spacious apartments and appointments for numerous bureau chiefs, with hundreds of clerks, many of whose services might well be dispensed with, providing room for additional mahogany, quarter-sawn oak, and swivel chairs.

Oh, no; the President of the United States has done no such thing. He will not do any such thing. It is unthinkable that the President would take out of a fund placed in his hands by Congress to be used secretly by him, because matters with which from time to time he has to deal are of such a character that they can not be discussed openly here or in any other forum, matters in which he makes the expenditures of large sums of money, without specific appropriation or discussion by Congress. That was the reason for placing the \$100,000,000 in his hands. That is the reason the remainder of it is there to-day. Does any newspaper publisher think the President would take any part of that fund and use it for the purpose indicated? Oh, no. The President would do no such thing. He has done no such thing as the newspapers have stated.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I would rather not. I have stated that this fund was placed in the hands of the President to enable him to do things without consulting Congress or anyone else because of the secrecy that is required in the consummation of certain transactions in preparing the Nation to meet a foreign foe. Does the purchase of a building to provide additional office space for clerks come within the scope of that authority? Oh, no. Those are matters that should be and are discussed on this floor. The wisdom or unwisdom of every specific proposition has been and ought to be discussed here. This is the place where authorizations for the purchase of sites for public buildings and the erection of public buildings are made here in Washington. They are not done in secret. Oh, no. And the President has not done this thing in a corner, nor in secret, and I challenge the newspapers of the country, the newspapers of Washington, that have published this statement to produce the evidence. I repeat neither the Secretary of the Treasury ever made such a request nor did the President of the United States ever grant such a request. It is unthinkable that it is so.

Now, for a moment about the Arlington site. The old Arlington Hotel was one of the most celebrated in the country. Travelers from all over the world made it their stopping place when in Washington. Guests from every quarter of our own country were entertained there. It was the stopping place of captains of industry, finance, and politics. Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan and Tom Platt made it their abiding place in Washington.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Do not forget the Gridiron Club, which made it famous.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And the Gridiron Club, which made the hotel famous. It was the situs of the most celebrated birthday dinner that has ever been given in the United States, the occasion of Uncle Joe's seventieth birthday anniversary. [Applause.] Early in 1912 it was decided by the company to tear down the old building and erect a new one, larger and more spacious in its appointments. The old hotel was torn down and a hole made in the ground. A series of

incidents occurred. The Democrats were successful in 1912; J. Pierpont Morgan, whom, it is alleged, was going to finance the enterprise, died; and the Arlington Hotel proposition failed. Court proceedings and foreclosure sales ensued. The property was offered for sale under a mortgage held by the Equitable Life Insurance Co. early in January, 1914. It was purchased by a company of gentlemen from Richmond, Va. Owing to some failure of a financial transaction immediately following the sale, the sale was not consummated, and the property was readvertised and sold again a week later. It sold for \$850,000. Some days later it sold for \$847,000, the purchasers giving a certified check for \$50,000 on the day of the sale, and subsequently giving another \$100,000, making a total that the purchasers have in the property of \$150,000. Since then financial embarrassment has attended the negotiations of the Arlington Hotel Co. They have made many efforts to unload the property and to get rid of it. It has been a great burden to them. It was far from a financial success. They attempted a year and a half ago to rent it to the Navy Department. They made a proposition to erect a spacious office building and rent it to the Navy Department for 65½ cents a square foot for a period of five years. This was submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, carefully considered, and the committee refused to take the lease of the property. Then there was more embarrassment in the Arlington Hotel Co.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The Committee on Appropriations refused to authorize the lease of the Arlington property and preferred to recommend an appropriation of \$2,000,000 to build temporary office buildings, the cost of which from an interest charge standpoint would not be anything like what the rent of that building would have been if they had rented it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The Committee on Appropriations acted wisely.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question.

Mr. CALDWELL. Is the gentleman's speech intended as a demonstration of the Republican support that his party is so proudly claiming for the President?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the Arlington Hotel Co. then sought to sell the property to the Treasury Department. That offer, so far as the Treasury Department was concerned, was apparently accepted. Authorizations were asked of Congress to consummate the purchase. Congress has been hearing evidence pro and con and has been dealing with the matter without very much enthusiasm. There has never been shown a very great disposition to make the purchase. Even this morning a resolution from the Committee on Rules making in order a bill for the purchase of the Arlington Hotel site, after having been offered was withdrawn, so that the Congress does not seem to be very enthusiastic over a transaction that would relieve the Arlington Hotel Co. of the great burden they have been carrying on an investment of \$150,000. The reasonableness of the price asked or the questions incident to it I shall not discuss at this time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Just for a question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. When Congress voted to the President a lump sum of \$100,000,000 for war purposes, did it not also grant to him the power to appropriate a part of that money for the purchase of the Arlington Hotel site or any other site if he thought it necessary as a war emergency?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It did not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman think that if in the estimation of the President it was necessary for purposes of war that he or the Secretary of the Treasury should purchase the Arlington Hotel or any other site that he did not have the power to do it with his \$100,000,000 fund? The practice, of course, is unusual.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, it would be a most violent assumption that the President would consider the purchase of hotel properties as war measures. What we need to win the war are arms, ammunition, airplanes, battle planes, ships, munitions of war of all kinds. We do not need hotel properties.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman would not yield to me a moment ago, and I was hoping some Democrat would take my place and ask the question whether or not the President had actually made this authorization. My own judgment is that he has—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I refuse to believe it.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I will state to the gentleman that the President has authorized the

expenditure of this fund upon the ground that it is a war-emergency measure, and upon the ground that in order to carry on the war the men who are working here in Washington must have a roof under which to work to protect themselves.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Unless the gentleman from North Carolina, whose word I would not dispute under any sort of circumstances, has positive proof coming to him from the President himself I still stand upon the assumption that the President has done nothing of the kind. [Laughter.]

Mr. POUL. With the gentleman's permission, I have a letter here, it will take just a moment if the gentleman will permit me, from the Secretary of the Treasury—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Well, that is not the admission of the President. [Laughter.]

Mr. POUL. With the permission of the gentleman, it says here:

I inclose copy of a letter I sent to the President in reference to the Arlington Building. The President has authorized me in the circumstances to acquire it out of the war-emergency fund.

The exigency is so great that it is not possible to delay action further. I earnestly hope, however, that the bill now pending in the House, and favorably reported by the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, will be passed as promptly as possible, in order that the President's war-emergency funds may be reimbursed.

That is dated March 28, 1918. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So that the gentleman believes the question now is one of reimbursement. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman permit me to read—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I would rather go on and let the gentleman from Illinois take time in his own right.

Mr. RAINEY. As to the law under which this is done—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will ask the gentleman to take time in his own right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. About half a minute.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU], notwithstanding the reading of the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, I do not modify a single statement that I have made here with respect to this subject and to the duty of the President with regard to this \$100,000,000 war fund. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL]. [Applause.]

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I was very much in hope when spring came that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] would catch the spirit of the season and get in a good humor. He seems to have been in a bad humor especially with all measures which seem to have the recommendation of the President of the United States and the executive heads of our departments, upon whom the responsibility for the proper conduct of this war exists, and I sincerely hope—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I hope—

Mr. CANTRILL (continuing). That this House will have the pleasure some time in the near future of hearing the gentleman from Kansas stand up here upon this floor and, as a patriotic American citizen ought to do, do something to uphold the hands of the President of the United States [applause on the Democratic side] instead of vicious and idle criticism of every move that the President and the departments undertake to make in the great crisis now facing this Nation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. CANTRILL. As to the merits of this proposition—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield? I hope the gentleman will not charge me with failing to support the President of the United States in all war measures. I have worked and voted for every measure—

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Kansas I will say that he, like some of the other Members of this House who take up all the time of the House on idle measures day after day in idle talk, when the roll comes does not dare stand before the American people and vote against what the President and the people want. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, as to the merits of this proposition, Mr. Chairman, the facts in the case are—and that is what this House wants are the facts—no man in my 10 years' experience here has ever heard me make a partisan speech criticizing gentlemen on the other side; this is no time for it and no place for it. What this

House wants to-day are the facts connected with this case for the purchase of the Arlington Hotel property. As a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, who heard in detail all of the facts connected with this property, and as a member of the Rules Committee, where those facts were rehearsed before that committee, I say to the committee, and the Record of the House bears me out, that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds by almost a unanimous vote, if not unanimous, decided to report a measure authorizing the appropriation of \$4,200,000 for the purchase of the Arlington Hotel property. The Members of the House know that the calendars of the House are loaded down, and the only way to get consideration of that measure was to come before the Rules Committee and get a rule to expedite the passage of this bill because it was a war measure, and I will prove it before I leave the floor. The Public Buildings and Grounds Committee thought it was a war measure and gave their unanimous support to it. The Committee on Rules, with the exception of the gentleman from Kansas, was of the opinion that it was of sufficient importance to bring in a special rule and ask this House to give this bill immediate consideration. Yet the House, acting under other rules, took up days and days in idle discussion of minor measures. The time had come when in order to secure this property at a reasonable price some one had to act, and pending the legislation in Congress, which has the indorsement of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the Rules Committee, the President has seen fit to act, and I, for one, say that he did right in doing what he did do, in giving the money to buy this property. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, the facts in the case—facts are strange things to the gentleman from Kansas, but the House wants them—the facts in the case are these: That this building is now in course of construction. I walked over it the other day and looked at it, and I think there are four stories above ground of steel construction now up. The building that is being erected there is not, as the gentleman from Kansas stated, a hotel piece of property, but it is a modern, up-to-date office building, and the hearings before the Committee on Rules showed that, and the gentleman from Kansas was not fair with the House when he undertook to make the House believe that it was a hotel going up there instead of a modern, up-to-date office building with the approval of the various building commissions of this city here behind it. Now, this building is to be used for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and by the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance.

And I want to say to this House that the room for these employees of the Government is absolutely needed at this moment, and that is why the President acted. The testimony, the facts, before the Rules Committee and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds showed that the three stories of this building underground are to be used for the preservation of the policies of the soldiers and sailors who are now in the service of their country, 1,000,000 life insurance policies having been taken out by the loyal soldiers and sailors of Uncle Sam. Where are those policies to-day? It would not be wise for me to state it here upon this floor. The committee members were advised in secret as to where they were located. Suffice it to say they are not where they ought to be, for their proper preservation. They now are being guarded day and night by armed soldiers in order to protect the interests of our boys.

The purpose of buying this property is to have proper storage immediately for these million policies of our soldiers and sailors, because, as stated before the committee, the strongest blow that could be given us to-day would be the destruction of these 1,000,000 policies, which would wipe out the record of every loyal soldier and sailor and deprive his family of the insurance that the Government intends him to have.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTRILL. I will.

Mr. GILLETT. When is this building going to be completed, so that it can be used for that purpose?

Mr. CANTRILL. The building is now under construction?

Mr. GILLETT. I understand it will be finished by the 1st of next October.

Mr. CANTRILL. I understand it is to be finished just as rapidly as it can be pushed to completion, whereas if we had to go into other parts of the city and buy property it would be delayed a year. And, gentlemen, let me say this to you, that in my opinion this is a proper place for the President of the United States to buy property. As said by the gentleman from Kansas, the Belasco corner has been purchased by the Treasury Department and a building authorized there. It ought to go there. It is just across Pennsylvania Avenue from the Treasury Department proper. It can be connected by tunnel under the Avenue with the Treasury, and just as soon as pos-

sible a building will be put up there and ought to be put up there, and Congress has already authorized it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CANTRILL. Can I get two or three minutes more?

Mr. BOOHER. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. CANTRILL. Thank you.

Now, as the Members of the House know, the Arlington Hotel property is just a square beyond the Belasco property. So that makes the Treasury Building and the Belasco property building, connected by tunnel under the Avenue, and the Arlington Hotel property, practically all within one square, under the direct control of the Treasury Department. It would be better if they could all be in one building, but every Member of Congress knows it is impossible to remodel the old Treasury Building so as to bring them under the same roof, and this is the nearest that can be done to put them together. It is in the proper location to be properly connected with the Treasury Department. It is upon very high ground, too, which is absolutely necessary, inasmuch as these million war policies have to be stored in the basement, and we need dry basements in order to store those policies properly or to store any other valuable papers of the Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTRILL. Just for a question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Ordinarily, when property is to be purchased by the Government, the procedure is for the department to come to Congress with an estimate to the committee that has real charge of the matter here?

Mr. CANTRILL. I will answer your question directly, because I want to give the House all the information I have, and I do not want to take up any time in indulging in anything but facts.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] complains about the price of the property. The record before the various committees shows that the Government paid for this lot about \$1,000,000. At forced sale it brought almost \$1,000,000, and for years has been listed and taxed by the city of Washington upon the basis of almost \$1,000,000.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTRILL. Just let me finish my answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania first.

And the Government has paid exactly what experts in the city have said it is worth, and not a dollar more than it is worth. The building which is going up has been carefully looked into by the Supervising Architect and his entire force, and the head men of that office and of the Treasury Department, after a full investigation of the cost of building material, labor, and all, and the cost of the lot, came before two committees of Congress and told us that the price paid in the bill is reasonable and practically the cost price of the property. And in that connection permit me to say to the House that in private conversation not long ago with a real estate man in this city, who had no interest whatever in the property and who happens to be my personal friend, I asked him for information on this subject, and he, as a practical real estate man in the city of Washington, told me that the Government was getting the full worth of its money in the purchase price of the Arlington Hotel property.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for a question purely for information?

Mr. CANTRILL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Does the \$4,500,000 measure the cost of the building when it is completed?

Mr. CANTRILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Four million two hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. CANTRILL. Four million two hundred thousand includes, I will say to the gentleman, the cost of the lot and the entire completed cost of the building, taking in the entire surface of the lot. There is but one-third of that lot that was not in the original plans when they started out to build this office building; but, in order to make room for the department, the third of the lot was added on, and the proposed building will cover the entire area. And I will say to the House that, in order to transact the business of the Government in the Commissioner of Internal Revenue's office and in the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, which is now housed in six different places in this city, with the records scattered from one end of the city to the other—and I am supported in my contention both by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and by the Committee on Rules—this purchase should be immediately put through; and I say the President was right in taking advantage of the opportunity and that it is the duty of this House to reimburse that fund.

Now, in answer to the gentleman from Kansas, undertaking to say that this is a secret fund given to the President, I will say it is no such thing. It is an emergency fund given to the President by this Congress to utilize as he pleases, and the President has done nothing in secret as intimated by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]. He has no secrets from the American people. He stands here doing what he believes is his duty, and I believe he did right, and I believe it is our duty in all fairness and all honesty to reimburse that fund. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On April 4, 1918:

H. R. 5351. An act providing for the disposal of certain lands in block 32, in the city of Port Angeles, State of Washington;

H. R. 11123. An act to amend an act approved September 24, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize an additional issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to extend additional credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes"; and

S. 2469. An act to authorize the change of name of the steamship *Caldera* to *A. T. Kinney*.

On April 5, 1918:

S. 3714. An act to provide further for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to provide credits for industries and enterprises in the United States necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war, and to supervise the issuance of securities, and for other purposes.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to supplement what has been so well said by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL] by submitting one or two observations.

If any gentleman has any doubt as to the necessity, the urgent necessity, of the action taken by the Secretary of the Treasury, indorsed by the President of the United States, I respectfully request that gentleman to send to the rooms of the Committee on Rules and get a copy of the brief hearing upon this proposition and read it. The hearing did not take up very much time, and every question that has been asked, I think, has been answered in the hearing by that committee. I understand the hearings had before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds have not been printed. They are somewhat fuller and go more into detail than the brief hearing held by the Committee on Rules.

The records of the War-Risk Insurance Bureau at this time are kept at eight different places in the city of Washington.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt my colleague?

Mr. POU. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GLASS. Did it appear in the evidence before the Committee on Rules that the Secretary of the Treasury did write a letter to the President, and that the proposition did receive the indorsement of the President?

Mr. POU. At the time the hearing was had by the Committee on Rules that action had not been taken.

The records of the War-Risk Insurance Bureau are kept at eight different places, in all sorts of buildings, some of them in highly combustible buildings.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POU. I do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman has a copy of the letter. Does he intend to insert it?

Mr. POU. Yes. I am going to ask to have it inserted in the RECORD and consume part of my time in having it read to the House.

These records of the War-Risk Bureau, which can not be replaced, are, as I have said, distributed in eight different buildings; and, as the gentleman from Kentucky has said, they are guarded night and day. Ten additional buildings are occupied by the Internal-Revenue Bureau, making 18 in all. There is no other available place in the city of Washington except this Arlington Building wherein these two great bureaus can be housed. Their records can not be consolidated under one roof

unless the Arlington Building is acquired, and in the circumstances the Secretary of the Treasury decided that the urgency was so great, that the danger was so great, he would not take the risk of destruction any longer, and he assumes the full responsibility for all that has been done.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question, entirely for information?

Mr. POU. I do.

Mr. REAVIS. I think all the Members of the House appreciate the necessity for the Treasury Department having more room. The complaint, if it may be called such, of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], as I understood it, was the alleged impropriety of purchasing this property out of the usual way. Ordinarily such things come on the floor of the House, where the necessity of the purchase and the price to be paid are debated and discussed. I wish the gentleman would state, if it will not interfere with his line of thought, what was there in the condition that would lead to the belief that Congress was not ready to act upon this and that would justify the President in making this purchase out of that fund and without waiting the action of Congress?

Mr. POU. The urgency, as I understand it, was simply this: If these records were to be put in a fireproof building and as nearly as possible under one roof, the Government must acquire this particular building, there being no other available building in the city; and the Secretary of the Treasury decided that the urgency was such that he felt it to be his duty to act; the urgency was such, the risk was so great, that he did not dare to wait longer upon the action of Congress. To him his duty was so obvious he felt he had the right to assume that his action would be ratified by Congress.

Mr. REAVIS. Just a word further.

Mr. POU. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. That was the decision of the Secretary of the Treasury? What I want to know from the chairman of the Committee on Rules is this: Would the facts justify that opinion? I mean by that this: Is it not possible, and was it not possible, for the Committee on Rules to submit that measure to Congress, so that it could have been acted upon immediately and without unnecessary delay?

Mr. POU. The Committee on Rules was intending to submit the matter to Congress. The rule had already been authorized, but the Secretary of the Treasury decided that it was a matter that ought to be acted upon at once, and for that he assumes full responsibility. As a matter of fact, one option held by the Government on this property had expired on the 11th of March. The Secretary did not know how long the offer of the owners to accept \$4,200,000 would be held open. He could not know that some private individual or corporation would not purchase the property. He simply knew it could be had now if proper action were taken. He had exhausted every effort to acquire space, and as the price was deemed fair and reasonable the Secretary decided he could not afford to wait.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me for a moment, I think I can help the whole situation by a plain recital of what occurred.

Mr. POU. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHERLEY. There came to the Committee on Appropriations an estimate for the purchase of the Arlington site and the erection of this building in exact accord with the action that has now been taken, the price being the same; but the estimate coming after the hearings had closed on the urgent deficiency bill, it was impossible at that time to have a hearing and make the item a part of that bill. When the urgent deficiency bill came on the floor it carried provisions for buildings for housing other activities of the Government. The question was raised by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds as to the action of the Committee on Appropriations in carrying provisions for buildings that had not been authorized. The point of order was made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], and the provision in regard to the housing of other activities went out of the bill. Subsequently it was permitted to be restored without the obtaining of a rule to make it in order.

In view of those facts it did not seem to the Committee on Appropriations that it would be warranted in undertaking to act upon the Arlington matter until authorization had been made by the Congress. In the meanwhile there has been a legislative congestion in this House. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds some time ago reported a bill to authorize the purchase of this site and buildings. If that bill were passed tomorrow there still would have to be an appropriation carried. Presumably the Secretary of the Treasury felt the need for either carrying out this project or undertaking some other, and as he believed this to be a desirable thing, and the action of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds confirming his

judgment, he has felt warranted in going ahead without waiting for the authorization and appropriation by Congress, which would probably have delayed action a month or two further.

I think this also ought to be said in view of what has been said by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEX]: The Committee on Appropriations has never functioned in this matter and has never turned down or approved this proposal, for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to make an inquiry, if it will not interrupt him?

Mr. POU. I have but little time.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman can get more time if he wants it.

Mr. POU. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Having regard for the construction of a new building as a permanent building for the Government, is it not desirable that the building when constructed shall have certain architectural features that will make it a desirable public building and an addition to the city of Washington, especially in that location? The Fine Arts Commission has a plan, which has been carefully worked out, embracing the construction of a building on that site. Has any consideration been given to the kind of building to be erected on that site; and if so, does anybody know what it will look like and what it will be worth?

Mr. POU. That matter was taken up and was considered in the agreement that the Secretary of the Treasury has made in respect to the purchase of the property.

The situation in a word was about this: The Secretary of the Treasury did not know how soon Congress was going to give him authority to take over this building. Of course, he could not know for certain that authority would be given, but he assumed it would be. That is the truth of it, and he decided that it was so necessary to act in the premises that he was willing to take the responsibility without waiting. He has done it, and he submits willingly to any criticism that may properly be made.

Mr. DILLON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POU. In a minute or two I will yield. Now, as to the cost of the building, any gentleman can determine that by reading the hearings. So far as I am concerned, I think there can be no just criticism as to the cost. As to the necessity for prompt action, let us bear in mind that these records are scattered over seven or eight different places, and may be destroyed at any minute. Every available building has been considered by the Treasury Department. I want to emphasize that this is the only building in the city of Washington which can be obtained anywhere in the near future for the housing of the invaluable records of the War-Risk Insurance Bureau. I send to the Clerk's desk and ask that the Clerk read in my time the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, this is the letter which bears the authorization of the President?

Mr. POU. It is.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think this letter ought to go into the RECORD.

Mr. DILLON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. POU. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. DILLON. Will the gentleman tell how much has been paid down on this proposition by the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. POU. I do not know. I presume nothing has been paid. I think nothing has been paid up to this time.

Mr. SLOAN. Just for information, I desire to know if the depositing of these insurance policies in some place for the Government is a requirement of the statute, or simply a policy of the Government? Ordinarily, these policies are sent to the holders or somebody who may be designated by the man for whose benefit a policy is taken out.

Mr. POU. I understand that records are kept in the city of Washington which, if destroyed, could not be replaced, and the destruction of which would bring about endless confusion. That is the information I get from the War-Risk Bureau.

Mr. DILLON. That is true of the records of the policies; but the gentleman spoke of keeping these policies on deposit.

Mr. POU. No; I was misunderstood. I simply alluded to the records of the War-Risk Bureau. My information is that it is desired to keep these records in a fireproof building, because if destroyed they could not be replaced and that the confusion resulting therefrom would be practically endless. I ask the Clerk to read the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, March 22, 1918.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You were good enough to approve, on February 12, an estimate, which was promptly submitted to the Congress, for the purchase by the Treasury Department of the Arlington Building,

now under construction, involving a cost, including the proposed annex to it, and such changes and modifications as will make it suitable for Treasury needs, of \$4,200,000. A bill was promptly introduced in the House, was reported favorably by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and is now pending. I am hopeful of early action by the House, but the calendar is somewhat crowded with other important matters and I do not know when this bill will be reached; and even after it has passed the House it must pass the Senate. How much time this will require I do not know. I am sure that there is every disposition on the part of the House and the Senate to expedite consideration of this matter, but at best it will take considerable time.

The situation in the Treasury Department is so exigent that I am deeply concerned about its ability to perform the vital work now required of it in the public interest unless immediate measures are taken to provide the amount of office space imperatively demanded. It is not only a question of amount of space, but also of the time within which it can be obtained. It is equally important that this space should be, as far as practicable, under one roof in order that efficiency and speed in the administration of important functions of the department may be secured. Not alone that, but the building should be fireproof in order that invaluable records, especially those in connection with the administration of the War-Risk and Internal Revenue Bureaus, may not be imperiled by fire.

The Arlington Building is partly constructed. It will have sufficient space to fill the imperative needs of the Treasury, and if taken hold of immediately by the Government can be pushed to prompt completion. If taken hold of now, it can also be constructed with reference to the Treasury's particular requirements, and, in addition to that, the exterior treatment of the building can be greatly improved without large additional cost, so as to make it far more attractive architecturally than the building as now designed.

As you know, the War-Risk Insurance Bureau is now taking care of the dependent families of our soldiers and sailors who are at the front, is administering over \$12,000,000,000 of insurance on the lives of our soldiers and sailors, and is performing the most prodigious task of its kind ever undertaken by any Government. This work is rapidly increasing, and of necessity must continue to increase with the growing list of killed and wounded and with the enlargement of the Army and Navy which must come with the progress of the war. The Internal Revenue Bureau must continue to grow as the war proceeds, in order to administer successfully the additional duties which will have to be imposed upon it. These two activities alone require more than 500,000 square feet of space in addition to the 96,000 square feet to be provided by the Treasury Annex soon to be erected on the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Madison Place. At present the War-Risk Bureau is being administered in 8 different buildings in Washington, the Internal Revenue in 10 different buildings. The inefficiency, delay, and unnecessary expense resulting from this scattering of the activities of these important bureaus are greater than I can describe. It is extremely hurtful to the public interest; in fact, it works an injustice to the dependents of our soldiers and sailors, and to our soldiers and sailors themselves, when the functions of the War-Risk Bureau are made inefficient because of inadequate office space in which to do the necessary work.

Not the least serious feature of this situation is the fact that the invaluable and irreplaceable records of the War-Risk Insurance Bureau and of the Internal Revenue Bureau are now in considerable part stored in nonfireproof buildings and might be destroyed, to say nothing of the possibilities of loss of human life from overcrowding in such buildings and the insanitary conditions under which the employees are now forced to work.

The activities of these two important bureaus are equaled in large measure by other bureaus of the Treasury, which administer the liberty-bond issues. It is impossible to describe the difficulties under which the Treasury is now laboring in its effort not only to raise essential money through the sale of liberty bonds, but to find room for the employees to work, in order to turn these bonds out promptly and deliver them to purchasers throughout the country. The corridors of the Treasury Building, where light and ventilation are poor, must be used from time to time for this service. It is an injustice to the employees and a reproach to the Government.

The railroad administration will require a large amount of space in order to efficiently manage the railroads of the United States now in the possession and control of the Government. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been good enough to give me as much space in their building as could be spared, but it is wholly insufficient. The railroad administration is seriously hampered even now for want of space, and that condition will grow more acute each day.

The War Finance Corporation, which will spring into existence as soon as the pending law is enacted and receives your approval, must have adequate space in which to do the important work assigned to it. This work will constantly increase with the progress of the war, and room must be provided for that purpose.

The responsibilities resting upon the Secretary of the Treasury are so numerous and important that it adds enormously to his burdens if the agencies under his control are unnecessarily scattered. Efficiency of administration will be greatly promoted by the consolidation, as far as practicable, of these great and responsible activities.

This is a war emergency of the most serious character. I can not overstate it. Every day of delay is aggravating the problem and imperiling the public interest. In these circumstances I am moved to beg you to allot to the Treasury \$4,200,000 out of the war-emergency fund in your control, with authority to expend so much of it as may be necessary in the purchase of the Arlington property and the completion of the building now under construction and in the erection of the proposed annex thereto. This will enable the Treasury to get back of the contractor and expedite the work greatly. If the Treasury can take possession of this property immediately, it will be possible to complete a large part of the building and have it ready for occupancy in the early fall.

If you will grant this request, the war-emergency fund may be reimbursed when the Congress passes the pending bill for the purchase of the Arlington property. I am most reluctant to make this request, but the situation is so exigent that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not do so.

I inclose a list of the 18 different buildings, together with a map, upon which is indicated their location in the city of Washington, from which you can see how widely the business of these two bureaus of the Treasury is now scattered.

It is far more economical and far more advantageous to the Government to buy the Arlington property and complete the building than to erect temporary, combustible structures which would represent a large loss in the end and be wholly unsatisfactory for the purposes in view.

Moreover, the activities of the Treasury Department, even after the restoration of peace, will necessitate the use of the Arlington building for a long period of time, if not permanently.

There is no other opportunity in Washington which will meet the Treasury's imperative need within a reasonable time or at all, so far as I have been able to discover.

With the earnest hope that this request may receive your prompt and favorable consideration, I am,

Faithfully, yours,

W. G. McAdoo.

The President,
The White House.

Inclosure.

Approved and authorized.

WOODROW WILSON.

25 MARCH, 1918.

Mr. POUL. The authority under which the President acted appears to be full and ample. After reading the law I submit there is absolutely no ground upon which any criticism of the President or of Secretary McAdoo can be based. The President clearly had authority to authorize this purchase of the property.

That part of the act of Congress approved April 17, 1917, under which the President acted reads as follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

For the national security and defense, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, to be expended at the discretion of the President, and to be immediately available and to remain available until December 31, 1917, \$100,000,000.

The act of December 15, 1917, continuing the appropriation reads:

EXECUTIVE.

The appropriation of \$100,000,000 "for the national security and defense, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, to be expended at the discretion of the President," contained in the general deficiency appropriation act approved April 17, 1917, is continued and made available until June 30, 1918.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That letter carries the approval and authorization of the President?

Mr. POUL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Therefore out of the \$100,000,000 fund the President has authorized the use of \$4,200,000 for this purchase.

Mr. POUL. Four million two hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Now, it seems to me that the question as to the propriety of the authorization is the question which concerns the gentlemen who have spoken.

Mr. POUL. I am going to conclude by asking unanimous consent to have printed, along with the letter which has just been read, a letter of Secretary McAdoo, of March 9, addressed to myself, answering several questions as to why the Government does not acquire this building and why the Government does not acquire that building.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, March 9, 1918.

Hon. EDWARD W. POUL,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I take pleasure in replying categorically to your three questions of the 8th instant indirectly bearing on the purchase of the Arlington property.

Question No. 1. Why doesn't the Government use the Poli Theater property?—Answer No. 1. Theater property is not at all suitable for departmental use. The lobby, auditorium, and stage occupy seven-eighths of the building and, being practically without natural light and ventilation, could not be utilized in their present condition. The cost of remodeling and reconstructing the building would be prohibitive, and even then the space would not be suitable for use by the Government nor would the amount of space be sufficient.

Question No. 2. Why doesn't the Government use the Oxford Hotel?—Answer No. 2. This building is in very poor repair and is cut up into small rooms, which would make the maintaining of an efficient organization impossible. The war-risk insurance and internal-revenue work require large spaces of from 5,000 to 10,000 square feet in one division. The building is also nonfireproof and of very light construction, so that it would not support the files in current use by these bureaus without strengthening the construction. Furthermore, the arrangement has been reached with the lessee of this hotel by which, in exchange for permission to keep the hotel in operation, he has turned over for Government use the four-story building No. 1209-11 Pennsylvania Avenue, containing 12,000 square feet of fairly satisfactory office space against 29,000 square feet in the Oxford Hotel of unsuitable space. Moreover, the demand for living rooms and space in Washington is so great that this property is more useful for hotel or boarding-house purposes than for any other.

Question No. 3. Why can't the Government utilize the G. A. R. Building?—Answer No. 3. A division of the Internal-Revenue Bureau is occupying this building with the exception of the hall on the top floor, the continued use of which has been granted to the Grand Army of the Republic.

There are several other buildings in the block bounded by Pennsylvania Avenue, E, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Streets which are being utilized to such an extent as is possible, and one four-story building, No. 406-8 Fourteenth Street, has been repaired and an extension built thereto, thus supplying about 26,000 square feet, but these buildings furnish only a very small fraction of the space required by the Treasury De-

partment. The War-Risk Insurance and Internal-Revenue Bureaus alone require 250,000 square feet each, or 500,000 square feet in all, which is half the size of the temporary building recently erected in Henry Park. All these buildings are highly combustible and should not be used for valuable records.

I hope the above information will furnish you the data required.

Sincerely,

W. G. McAdoo.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman have put into his remarks the law appropriating this \$100,000,000 for the use of the President, so that we may see that he had the authority to use it for that purpose?

Mr. POUL. The law is, of course, available. If I can do so conveniently, I will have it inserted.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I conclude with just this statement: Even after the building is erected adjoining the Belasco Theater, and even after this building is acquired, there will still be a deficit of some 20,000 or 30,000 square feet of necessary space, as I understand it. It will take every inch of these buildings in order to house those engaged in this Government work.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Young, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3400) to regulate the pay of retired chief warrant officers and warrant officers on active duty.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 9054) disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GORE, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. GRONNA, and Mr. NORRIS as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman from Iowa kindly allow me to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK]?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. You have used twice as much time on that side as we have used on this side, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] desires to follow the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POUL].

Mr. SMALL. I am aware of that. I hope the remarks of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] will end this discussion about the acquisition of the Arlington Hotel building. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] is chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and desires to speak now.

Mr. FREAR. I am very desirous of finishing to-day.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Under the circumstances, I do not think the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] ought to ask that the gentleman from Florida speak now. You have used twice as much time as we have, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] is a member of the committee.

Mr. SMALL. I assume that the gentleman from Wisconsin does not desire to discuss the Arlington proposition. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] desires to discuss that, and we hope to end the discussion on that subject with his remarks.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Would it not be just as well to have a little discussion on the bill?

Mr. FREAR. I do not inflict myself on the House very frequently. I would be very glad to listen to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], but there may be others who may desire to be heard on the same proposition following him.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman from Florida says he will be satisfied with five minutes.

Mr. FREAR. All right.

Mr. SMALL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to enter into any lengthy discussion of this matter. It has been pretty thoroughly discussed, and I do not care to take up the time of the committee. I want principally to ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a couple of letters, one of them being a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, of the same date as the letter that has been read, and in which he inclosed a copy of that letter to me. I also want to ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD a letter from Secretary McAdoo of February 26 last on this same subject.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman if the letter of the Secretary is the same letter which bears the approval and authorization for the use of the \$4,200,000 by the President of the United States?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. His approval is there?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Absolutely. Mr. Chairman, this building will contain 10 stories and an attic above ground and 3 stories below ground, which makes splendid space for the storage of records, and so forth. It is to be a building in keeping with the Treasury Department Building and buildings of that character. It is to be a magnificent building. It will save the Government about \$104,000 a year in rent. The Secretary wants the building mainly on account of the War-Risk Insurance Bureau. The War-Risk Bureau had about \$12,000,000 of insurance applications pending at the time of the hearings, and all of the papers are scattered about in fire traps liable to be destroyed at any time.

It occurs to me, Mr. Chairman, that under the law giving the President the \$100,000,000 fund he had a perfect right to divert this much of it for this great war necessity. All of the men and women of this country who have boys in the trenches are interested in the preservation of these papers, which could not be replaced if they were lost. Therefore this arrangement has been made, and nothing has been attempted to be concealed about it. I understand that the Secretary of the Treasury wrote the same letter that he sent to me to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] and to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], and there was absolutely no attempt at secrecy. If the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] had not heard of this transaction, he is perhaps the only Member of Congress who had not the information that this action had been taken. There was absolutely no purpose on the part of anybody to conceal it; it was open and aboveboard.

The Secretary of the Treasury had a right to ask it and the President had a right to do it, and they are both willing to stand on their rights to enter into this contract under the law which we enacted. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to insert these letters that I have referred to in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letters are as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 26, 1918.

HON. FRANK CLARK,
Chairman Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CLARK: Referring to your communication of the 23d instant, I take pleasure in transmitting herewith the following additional data regarding the Arlington proposition:

Estimated cost by the Office of Supervising Architect:

Main building	\$2,262,848
(This includes \$118,751 for changes required by the Treasury Department, such as modification in design, strengthening floor construction, etc.)	
Extension to building	850,502
Site as valued by the Treasury Department	1,000,000
	4,122,350

The actual proposal of the Arlington Building (Inc.) is \$4,119,072.

The estimate and the actual proposal are in very close agreement. The Treasury Department has asked for \$4,200,000, so as to have a contingent fund for changes incident to assignment, such as rearrangement of partition work, conduits, and wiring for addressograph and other machines, and also for awnings, shades, etc.

The cost per cubic foot is 40 cents for the main building and 44 cents for the extension. The higher cost of the extension is accounted for because as yet there are no subcontracts in force and consequently labor and material will have to be paid for at a higher rate.

The unit cost of the building and extension combined is 41½ cents per cubic foot.

The site has been included in the estimate at \$1,000,000, which is based on the valuation of three real estate experts, as follows:

No. 1. Minimum value	\$1,257,745
No. 2. District assessor's office	1,042,821
No. 3. \$900,000 to \$950,000, average	925,000

The average value of the three valuations is \$1,075,188.

This appears to fully justify the valuation by the Treasury Department at \$1,000,000.

The structural design of the building has been examined by engineers of the Office of the Supervising Architect and found satisfactory with the exception of the floor construction, which was considered too light for Treasury use, in consequence of which an agreement has been reached with the owners to strengthen the floors so as to make them safe for a live load of 100 pounds per square foot for offices and 120 pounds for corridors.

It is pertinent in this connection to call attention to the beams connecting the columns, which are very light in appearance. This has led to some criticism by people not conversant with the method of construction used in this building. However, these beams are not designed to carry the floor loads but serve to hold the columns in position during erection and in the completed structure become tension members of concrete girders. This method of construction has the approval of building bureaus of several large cities, among others, New York, Baltimore, and the District of Columbia.

I have previously shown the necessity of providing suitable quarters for the Internal Revenue Bureau, and especially the War-Risk Insurance Bureau, and I believe your committee is fully convinced of this as an urgent war measure. The only two methods of providing space is by erecting a temporary structure or acquiring the Arlington Build-

ing, and that the latter is greatly to the advantage of the Government is shown by the following comparative figures:

The temporary buildings recently erected have cost from \$2 to \$2.35 per square foot of floor area. Assuming the cost at only \$2, and the operating expense at 21 cents against 27 cents in the Arlington Building, and assuming the life of the temporary building to be four years, which is probably longer than it can be maintained, then the Government will at the end of the four-year period have expended \$1,921,280 for the temporary building against only \$1,648,640 for the Arlington Building, or \$272,640 less. The following table gives this information in detail:

Life of temporary building assumed at four years—depreciation 25 per cent, interest 4 per cent, operating expense 21 cents, cost assumed at \$2 per square foot gross floor area.

Arlington Building—depreciation 2½ per cent, interest 4 per cent, operating expenses 27 cents.

<i>Temporary building.</i>	
Interest, 4 per cent on \$1,216,000	\$48,640
Depreciation, 25 per cent on \$1,216,000	304,000
Operating expenses, 21 cents on 608,000 square feet	127,680
Total per year	480,320
<i>Arlington Building.</i>	
Interest, 4 per cent on \$4,200,000	168,000
Depreciation, 2½ per cent on \$3,200,000	80,000
Operating expenses, 27 cents on 608,000 square feet	161,160
Total per year	412,160

At end of year.	Temporary building.		Arlington building.	
	Per square foot.	Total.	Per square foot.	Total.
First	\$0.79	\$480,320	\$0.67½	\$412,160
Second	1.58	960,640	1.35	824,320
Third	2.37	1,440,960	2.03	1,236,480
Fourth	3.16	1,921,280	2.71	1,648,640

Temporary building	\$1,921,280
Arlington Building	1,648,640

Saving in favor of Arlington Building 272,640

Considered on a rental basis, the temporary building costs 79 cents per square foot per year against 67½ cents for the Arlington Building.

It is now not possible to rent any more office space in Washington, but if it were obtainable it would cost not less than twice as much, and probably three times as much, as the Arlington Building.

It is evident that this is a first-class business opportunity that the Government should not neglect, especially as the price is considered reasonable.

Sincerely, yours,

W. G. McADOO, Secretary.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, March 28, 1918.

HON. FRANK CLARK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CLARK: I inclose copy of a letter I sent the President in reference to the Arlington Building. The President has authorized me in the circumstances to acquire it out of the war emergency fund.

The exigency is so great that it is not possible to delay action further. I earnestly hope, however, that the bill now pending in the House and favorably reported by the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, will be passed as promptly as possible, in order that the President's war emergency fund may be reimbursed.

Assuring you of my appreciation of all that you have done in this connection, I am, with warm regard,

Cordially, yours,

W. G. McADOO.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to state one thing further, and then I am through. The testimony was not printed, at the special request of Assistant Secretary Love, who made statements which he said ought not to go to the public. The testimony has been transcribed, is in my office, and any gentleman of the House is at liberty to see it at any time he desires.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to digress from the river and harbor bill for a few moments. There is a matter of far more importance before the country at this time than the river and harbor bill. I desire to speak on the subject of Wisconsin's position before the country at large and to discuss matters of national moment that concern the whole country. My attention has been called particularly to an advertisement which I will read and may again refer to later. This advertisement was published in the Rockford Morning Star, a Democratic paper at Rockford, Ill. It could not be published in my own State without having attached to it the signature of the person authorizing it at that time. It violates the Wisconsin law, because it is unsponsored. It is an advertisement two columns in width and is addressed to Wisconsin soldier boys in the camp near Rockford, Ill., and is as follows:

TO THE WISCONSIN SOLDIERS AT CAMP GRANT.

Tuesday, April 2, you are entitled to vote for United States Senator from Wisconsin to succeed Paul O. Husting.

President Wilson, your Commander in Chief, desires all loyal Americans to vote for Joseph E. Davies for United States Senator.

Davies's election means joy at Washington and gloom at Berlin. Davies's defeat means gloom at Washington and joy at Berlin.

Mr. Chairman, one of the ablest Democrats at either end of the Capitol recently said in public debate:

It will be conceded without argument that I have been, perhaps, as bitter a partisan Democrat as has sat in this Chamber for many years, * * * but when it comes to a question of loyalty to this Government, I deny that there can be drawn a line between a loyal Democrat and a loyal Republican.

I know as I look across the aisle—

He continued—

that I am looking into the faces of men whose sons are, some of them, upon the battle line, some of them in training camps, and some of them upon the blue waves of the ocean. * * * As I look upon this side I see men whose sons are engaged in the same loyal service. As I look into the hearts of all here I know that each man would give his last drop of blood that surges through his veins if he could bring victory to our armies and a glorious fruition to our hopes. * * * Let the election go on in Wisconsin. Let us go on with our business here. * * * I say as a Democrat that if either one of the leading candidates is returned, a loyal man will be sworn in at yonder desk.

Mr. Chairman, I have quoted the words of a distinguished Senator [Mr. REED], whose patriotism rises far above the plane of petty partisanship, and I do so for the purpose of making a brief observation on the same subject.

In opposition to this spirit of loyalty and patriotism the Democratic senatorial whip, Mr. LEWIS, declared in the New Hampshire special election last year that a vote for the Republican candidate for Congress was a vote for the Kaiser. His statement was repudiated by an intelligent electorate, and a Republican Member from New Hampshire was added to those on this side of the aisle, all of whom are supporting every war measure in the present world conflict. The same Democratic senatorial whip has recently presented his usual arguments to the people of Wisconsin in the senatorial campaign with like results, the election of a Republican. [Applause on Republican side.]

That partisan issue of comparative loyalty was attempted last election in Indiana, the home of Vice President MARSHALL, and a former Democratic Member of this body, Mr. Gray, sought reelection through a letter approving his candidacy written by President Wilson. Notwithstanding other active support, Mr. Gray was defeated and a Republican elected who has supported every war measure. [Applause on Republican side.]

Every measure for the prosecution of the war has been supported by practically every Republican and Democrat in the House. There has been no aisle between us in this expression of loyalty to our common Government, and we have not distinguished between upholding a Democratic or Republican President. Although we differ here on political questions, it is not a Democratic country or a Democratic war that commands our allegiance, but a common country and that country's cause which we unitedly support and will continue to support.

This much may properly be said at this time, because of partisan attempts outside of Congress to misrepresent those who are giving their boys on this side of the House and who have loyally contributed all that can be given to our Government in her hour of national crisis.

Ever since the beginning of the European war, nearly four years ago, demands for a united national spirit have been voiced by administration Members and the press. Since our own entrance into the war, legislative criticism of administration mistakes, inefficiency, or extravagance have been tabooed by Republicans and partisanship relegated to the rear. Republican Representatives have unitedly supported every war measure asked for by the President and have avoided criticisms of the party in power, which, on the other hand, has maintained close party supremacy in all matters. We will continue to uphold the President in the prosecution of the war, loyally and wholeheartedly. Our country's cause is greater than any party. [Applause.]

DURING A GREAT WAR CRISIS.

A senatorial election occurred in Wisconsin this week, and the political dogs of war let loose. Closely following claims of grave war inefficiency made to the country by the Democratic leader, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, chairman of the Senate Military Committee, who startled the country with disclosures of lack of arms, clothing, and proper sanitary conditions for our soldiers; on the same day of a senatorial investigation, disclosing that \$800,000,000 in appropriations by Congress for aeroplanes had not yet resulted in a single war plane being shipped to Europe or a single cannon sent to our troops abroad; on a day when important war measures were pending in both branches of Congress; on the day of the greatest battle in all history, with our own American troops engaged, in France; on a day when the world waited in breathless suspense for tidings from that battle—on that day the Vice President of the United States and the Democratic senatorial whip were reported by the press to be far away from their post of duty, demanding of the people of Wisconsin support for the Democratic candidate for the Senate under penalty of being de-

nounced as against their country and for the Kaiser, and as a disloyal people, while the Democratic candidate for Senator, armed with a letter from the President, with its "acid test" of the same import, was repeating bitter partisan claims of superloyalty.

A startling two-column advertisement, presumably with authority from the Democratic National Committee, appeared in a Rockford (Ill.) paper prior to the Wisconsin election:

That advertisement I have already read to the House.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Will not the gentleman again read the advertisement of which he speaks?

Mr. FREAR. I have already read it, but I will read it again. It is as follows:

Tuesday, April 2, you are entitled to vote for United States Senator from Wisconsin to succeed Senator Paul O. Husting. President Wilson, your Commander in Chief, desires all loyal Americans to vote for Joseph E. Davies for United States Senator.

Davies's election means joy at Washington and gloom at Berlin.

Davies's defeat means gloom at Washington and joy at Berlin.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, one moment. I think the gentleman omitted to read the heading of the advertisement.

Mr. FREAR. It is headed, "To the Wisconsin Soldiers at Camp Grant." There we have several thousand Wisconsin soldiers, and I wish to refer particularly to the soldiers of Wisconsin before I have finished.

For extreme partisanship, nothing in American politics has ever equaled this infamous statement that Davies's defeat means gloom at Washington and joy at Berlin.

Who gives joy to Berlin? Who gives joy to the Kaiser? Those who make that false issue in New Hampshire and Wisconsin. [Applause on Republican side.] Those who sink all interests, State and National, through miserable appeals to prejudice in hopes of thereby securing partisan success. They, and they alone, have given to Berlin and the world a false issue. Those who printed that statement are more to be condemned than ignorant men who are misled and act on such palpable falsehoods.

Mr. Chairman, the soldiers will not be deceived, although a few may be improperly influenced. I served with the Wisconsin National Guard for 11 years in addition to 5 years' service in the Regular Army, and know the boys in service.

[NOTE.—The Camp Grant soldier vote for Senator was: Lenroot, 576; Davies, 403; Berger, 85.]

The boys of Wisconsin are intelligent and not easily misled, but the men who sought to deceive them by that wicked article have an account to settle with the American people. [Applause on Republican side.]

Democratic governors, Congressmen, Senators, and heads of bureaus by the score from Washington were called upon to join in this recent drive to make Wisconsin safe for partisan Democracy. The battle has been fought before an intelligent, discriminating electorate. The partisan methods are to be deplored, but the result is a triumph for the American spirit of fair play and high ideals, which refuses to measure loyalty by lip service or party labels.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss the unprecedented action of distinguished officials in seeking to advance interests of the Democratic candidate by charges of wholesale disloyalty against my State at a time when every ounce of energy should be joined in united effort here; when Wisconsin's sons are giving their full measure of devotion in France; and when every man, be he a Democrat or Republican, is first of all a loyal American. That slander has been publicly rebuked by the electorate of Wisconsin. I do say that the "acid test" of loyalty mentioned in President Wilson's letter and Vice President Marshall's speech on the McLemore and other prewar measures would empty the seats of one-third of the membership of this House, Democrats and Republicans alike, notwithstanding these same members have stood for and voted for every war measure presented to Congress.

That "acid test" of votes before the declaration of war would bar Congressman MANN, the distinguished leader of the House minority, whose loyalty and patriotism is unimpeachable. Even the veteran leader and eminently patriotic ex-Speaker CANNON [applause], the grand old man who sits before me, with his four score years and lifelong record of great public service and unrivaled loyalty, would fail the President's test. Congressman Woods, chairman of the congressional committee, who enjoys the respect and high esteem of every House Member, and Representatives LENROOT, ESCH, HAUGEN, COOPER, HAYES, MASON, DAVIS, and scores of other strong, loyal Republicans, would be disqualified by the President for public service.

DEMOCRATIC LEADERS AND THE ACID TEST.

More remarkable, the President's "acid test" on votes cast prior to the war would remove from Congress the distinguished Democratic leader of the House, Mr. KITCHIN, of North Carolina, whose able direction of war measures has been loyally supported by Members on both sides of the party aisle. Representative Fitzgerald, the Democratic wheel horse from New York, and FOSTER, KEATING, SLAYDEN, SHACKLEFORD, General SHERWOOD, hero of over 40 battles during the Civil War [applause], and many other strong Democratic Members voted against measures that the President now declares in his letter are "acid tests" of loyalty when applied to a Republican candidate for the Senate in Wisconsin. All these distinguished men and loyal Americans are included in the indictment lodged against the State of Wisconsin. Wisconsin, indeed, is in good company. If acid tests apply in Wisconsin and New Hampshire, then surely they applied to Gray, of Indiana, who voted against the "acid-test" measures and yet received the President's written approval. Does not the test apply to Democrats in Missouri, Mississippi, Texas, and North Carolina? Can the President say, "One rule for northern Republicans, but another for southern Democrats"? If so, why?

More significant of present-day partisanship, the President's acid test, if applied to Abraham Lincoln, who actively opposed the Mexican War, would have disqualified our greatest American and martyred war President from reelection to this House or from any higher office, notwithstanding his unquestioned loyalty to his Government after war was once declared.

Senator Stephen A. Douglas, Gen. McClellan, both candidates for the presidency, and many Democrats whose names are high in history and who loyally supported their Government after war was declared in 1861, would not meet the "acid test" of present-day partisanship as now applied to loyal Republicans.

Is there any difference in the loyalty of the official, however high, and that offered by the humblest mother in the land who hoped and prayed against war, but gave her all when her country called?

Even President Wilson said to us in his messages prior to the war, "I am inclined to think that Germany had a right to sink belligerent ships without warning," and five weeks before entering the war he said he was "not contemplating war or any steps that might lead to it."

Who will question the right of utterance of such sentiments prior to the declaration of war, or the patriotism of the President, or of hundreds of thousands of fathers and mothers who anxiously prayed against war and for guidance from on High for the President in his hours of trial and responsibility. What proportion of the people of this country would have passed this "acid test" before the declaration of war no man can tell, and candidates who make claims of superloyalty now, must offer their own records of service for war and greater sacrifice in its prosecution. Silence in the past on the part of those without records will not meet "acid tests," though they bear a President's indorsement, for the same reason that Congressman Gray, of Indiana, who failed in the test and election, received that same high indorsement before defeat.

SELF-APPOINTED AND SELF-APPOINTED PATRIOTS WILL BE TESTED IN THE CRUCIBLE OF FIRM AND TRIED AMERICANISM, NOT BY POLITICAL OR PARTISAN STANDARDS.

When Congress declared war, Representatives in Congress, Democrats and Republicans, unitedly gave loyal support to every measure that would help win the war, and their example has been emulated by every State and every community throughout the country. That must be the true test of loyalty.

WISCONSIN'S PROVED LOYALTY.

Wisconsin has been criticized by men high in authority. Let them bring forward the record of their own States, native or by adoption, for comparison. Evidenced by volunteer enlistments the official record shows 54 per cent, or proportionately more soldiers have volunteered from Wisconsin in this war than from any other of the 12 largest States drawn upon for our Army. Wisconsin has over 40,000 men under arms now in this war, and measured by the number of her soldiers in France, approximating 20,000, Wisconsin is second to none at the battle front. Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I would like to say that in an article published in a newspaper just a few days ago the statement was made that for every 15 soldiers in France at this time there was 1 soldier from Wisconsin.

Mr. FOCHT. And let me say, in further tribute to the patriotism of Minnesota and Wisconsin, that, but for the troops from those States, when Meade rode up to Hancock on the

slopes of Gettysburg and on that fateful day asked him for God's sake to hold those lines for five minutes, the Union would have been lost; but the troops from Minnesota and Wisconsin did rush up and they held the lines and gallantly helped roll back the tide of treason to defeat and brilliantly aided in rescuing the Union from destruction.

Mr. BRITTEN. And I would like to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that my father was among those troops from Wisconsin.

Mr. FREAR. My father was in a Wisconsin Cavalry regiment, with three and one-half years' service, and I had two uncles wounded in the Battle of Gettysburg, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania so eloquently described, and I have a boy now in France. [Applause.] The remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] and other gentlemen are greatly appreciated, for I was about to refer to the fact that Wisconsin furnished the greater part of the Iron Brigade that saved the day at Gettysburg and saved the Union, and a hundred thousand brave soldiers was my State's contribution to that war. In financial aid and quick support of her country's cause in this war and past wars Wisconsin's record for patriotism invites comparison with any State, North or South, none excepted.

New York, New Jersey, Indiana, Virginia, and Mississippi have given loyal support at different times in past history. Wisconsin's critics have arisen from such States, but in past wars and in this war not one of these States has been more consistently loyal or unflinching in tests of sacrifice, national love, and defense of country than my own State. History records the constant loyalty of her people and their glorious achievements. Wisconsin has never wavered in devotion to that flag.

However high the station, critics will find no State with better record for progress, legislative accomplishment, or steadfast patriotic support of our Government in peace or war.

MEN ARE NOT MISLED BY TRANSPARENT PURPOSES.

Attempts have failed to frighten men into the ranks of the Democratic Party either in New Hampshire, Indiana, Wisconsin, or any other State by raising a partisan cry, more to be condemned than the bloody shirt of old, and my distinguished colleague, Mr. LENROOT, one of the ablest Members of this House, whose record for loyalty is unimpeachable, has been vindicated by the people of the great State of Wisconsin.

By a vote of over 150,000 he has been selected by those who know him best for the highest honor in the gift of the State—to represent a people whose intelligence, discriminating judgment, and patriotism will meet every test of loyalty and service in the future as in the past, to represent Wisconsin, the State that is and always has been loyal to this Government. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I have here a telegram from the adjutant general of the State of Wisconsin, to whom I applied for information respecting the Wisconsin troops to-day under arms. That telegram is as follows:

MADISON, WIS., March 31, 1918.

HON. JAMES A. FREAR, M. C.,

House of Representatives:

To date Wisconsin has put into military service under draft act 14,690 men, the excess of 1,814 over draft quota requirement being result of voluntary induction. Credit for voluntary enlistment Wisconsin National Guard previous to August 5 not fully settled, but War Department offers total credit of 19,217 men.

War Department has also given credit for Regular Army enlistments, period of April 1 to June 30, inclusive, 1917, 1,586 men. Total known credit, 35,493. The foregoing takes no account of enlistments, Regular Army, except during those months named, National Guard since August 5 last, nor of any voluntary enlistment, engineers, forestry, or other special organizations, nor in United States Navy, since no official data as to these are available in this office, but indications are that total of these, including Navy, exceeds 7,500. It is known that the entire Guard except a few casualties is with the Rainbow and Thirty-second Division now somewhere in Europe. With Wisconsin men in other units, it may safely be stated that there are approximately 20,000 Wisconsin soldiers on or near the battle lines.

ORLANDO HOLWAY, Adjutant General.

I believe no State in the country in proportion to its population can offer such a splendid record. I state this on all the facts that have come to my hands.

When the *Tuscania* was sunk not long since, there were 89 men from my district alone on that boat. Wisconsin had more troops on the *Tuscania* than any other State. The first soldier boys killed in this war and in the Spanish-American War were from Wisconsin. Our boys are in France to-day, many of them with the State guard of which I was a member for many years, and among them is the company I organized over 25 years ago. They are fighting for this war with boys of parents on the Democratic side of the aisle of this House.

WISCONSIN'S SPLENDID RECORD FOR LAW AND ORDER.

I sent to the Attorney General of the United States for a statement regarding Wisconsin and the record of offenses in a

State possessing nearly 3,000,000 people. You have understood, I suppose, that there have been mobs and lawlessness there like in other States recently, burnings, explosions, mob-rule, strikes and riots. The Attorney General's office, Washington, D. C., gives the following list of offenses in Wisconsin in both the eastern and the western districts. Remember this State has over 2,500,000 people within its borders, and practically 42 per cent of our boys who are at the front to-day, according to statements I will submit, are soldiers of German extraction. Here are the number of suits: Conspiracy in connection with the draft in Wisconsin, how many? One. Explosives act, how many suits were brought by the Government under that act in the State of Wisconsin? One. Trading-with-the-enemy act, how many cases have been brought—remember this is the official statement from headquarters? None.

The national-defense act, how many cases of violation of that act? None. The espionage act, how many cases under that act that covers practically every offense that can be suggested? Seven; all are pending; not one has been tried. No civil cases were brought by the Federal Government in the State. Selling liquor to soldiers, 37. That is the record. There have been no riots, no strikes, no mobs, or attempts to blow up or destroy either Government or private property; not one in the entire State of Wisconsin. Wisconsin is a lawabiding, loyal State. Gov. Philipp, of my own State, wrote me a personal letter recently, from which I read a brief extract. He says:

I am heartily tired of seeing our people abused every day by an element of the press and a class of men who seriously regard themselves as patriots, but who, as a matter of fact, do not now, nor will they in the future, render the State or the Nation any service that is worth while. I propose to make a fight against the men and the newspapers that engage in that sort of falsehood and at least show them up, if I can not do any more.

Mr. Chairman, that is about all we can do. Falsehoods and misrepresentation can not be reached by us under the espionage act. Everyone can take his fling at the people of a great State.

I have a brief statement received from one of my good Democratic friends in New York the other day about the New York City election, where over 150,000 plurality was given Hylan over Mitchel, who insisted on running as a loyalist or royalist candidate, better than his fellow citizens, as though we are not all loyal. The man who won out, Hylan, had for his father a Union soldier, as was mine. [Applause.] I understand Mitchel's was not. Every newspaper in New York City with one exception—I have a list here—was in favor of Mitchel, who ran on that platform. A vote against Mitchel was to be a message to the Kaiser that New York was disloyal; that was the miserable twaddle indulged in by reputable papers. Two million dollars was contributed to Mitchel's campaign. Were the people of New York disloyal? Only those who made the false issue; only those who stuffed the ballot boxes for Mitchel, of whom 36 officials were convicted out of 72 indicted.

The people of New York are loyal, although they defeated Mitchel over 2 to 1. They are as loyal as the people of New Jersey, Wisconsin, Tennessee, Louisiana, or any other State. They are loyal, and you can not make me believe otherwise. [Applause.] Their boys are going to the front to-day just as willingly and gladly as the boys of fathers who plume themselves on superpatriotism, and their fathers are back here in the factories, mills, offices, and workshops doing what little they can to help win the war. I will insert an exhibit relating to Wisconsin and then speak briefly on the river and harbor bill, which is the order of business. [Applause.]

WISCONSIN IS FIRST IN LOYAL SERVICE.

LOYALTY RESOLUTION BY REPUBLICANS OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE.

The following resolution, adopted by the Republicans of the Wisconsin Legislature at the last legislative session, gives a full and complete answer to charges of disloyalty registered against the citizenship of Wisconsin. The last paragraph is commended to the attention of those who engage in factional loyalty:

The people of the State of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, hereby again renew their allegiance to the Republic, and pledge their loyalty and undivided support to the National Government in its prosecution of the present war to a successful end, and in this moment of struggle, which threatens the very existence of the Nation, will never shrink in their duty as loyal citizens of their beloved country.

The State of Wisconsin stands second to none in meeting the demands made upon it by the Federal Government for our national defense. Wisconsin took the initiative in providing for the dependents of its soldiers, and has made the most liberal provision for them of any State in the Union.

Wisconsin placed its entire election machinery at the disposal of the United States in the first registration for selective service.

Wisconsin was the first State in the Union to file a complete return of its registration under the selective law with the Federal Government at Washington.

In Wisconsin less than 2 per cent of the men called under the selective-service law failed to respond to the call, while in the United States as a whole 8.2 per cent of those called failed to respond.

Wisconsin stands at the head of the list of her neighboring States in the percentage of volunteer enlistments, which numbered over 17,000, 45 per cent of which are of Teutonic blood. The percentage in Illinois was 34.8; Indiana, 41.6; Iowa, 50; Michigan, 31.1; Minnesota, 34.1; Kentucky, 35.8, while in Wisconsin our percentage was 54.5.

Wisconsin's troops when they left Camp Douglas were fully equipped, not by the Federal Government, but by the State.

Wisconsin's citizens have contributed over \$125,000,000 to liberty loans, Red Cross, Young Men's Christian Association, Young Women's Christian Association, Knights of Columbus, and other war activities. Our subscription to the first liberty loan was \$36,236,750; our subscription to the second liberty loan was \$87,056,900. In the seventh Federal reserve district the subscription of this State was 155 per cent of its minimum allotment. In this loan Wisconsin stood at the head of all the States in this district. Illinois stood second, with a percentage of 152.8; Michigan third, with a percentage of 142.5; Indiana fourth, with a percentage of 122, and Iowa fifth, with a percentage of 111.4.

Wisconsin is proud of the foregoing record, and submits the same to the fair and impartial judgment of all loyal citizens of the Nation and pledges itself to even greater accomplishments in the future.

The people of the State of Wisconsin have and always will stand squarely behind the National Government in all things which are essential to bring the present war to a successful end, and we condemn as unpatriotic all activities which seek to breed the spirit of disloyalty among the people of our State.

EXTRAVAGANCE, PROFITEERING, AND TAXATION.

THE 1918 WATERWAY BILL IS REDUCED OVER \$20,000,000, BUT CONTAINS MANY WASTEFUL ITEMS.

Mr. Chairman, I will now address myself to the pending river and harbor bill before us, which carries \$19,227,900, or less than one-half the amount generally appropriated. At a time when war expenditures demand every dollar that can be spared that fact makes the bill an improvement over its predecessors.

The Army engineers have recommended some appropriations that seem to me inexcusable. I have mentioned them in my report, and I will speak briefly about them here, and in addition point out what are inexcusable and wasteful expenditures by new bureaus organized apparently for self-glorification, judging from newspaper accounts of their proposed labors, written by paid publicity agents.

The committee has reported only items urged by Army engineers at this time. No new projects, excepting two so-called Pacific coast war items, are included. As in the past, the minority report points out what seems inexcusable extravagance at this time, reaching many millions of dollars in the aggregate, as will be more fully set forth, while the right to criticize or oppose such items was reserved. It is realized, however, that many real waterways need improvement, and several large harbor projects are needed for war purposes, so the bill is not opposed as a whole.

Let me offer comparisons found on page 3 of the minority report, which speak for themselves and are indicative of others contained in the 1918 bill. They deserve the study of every Member, and are taken from the 120 river and harbor items that reach \$19,227,900, as stated:

Amazing comparisons of water-borne commerce and cost.

[From United States Engineers Reports, 1917.]

	Tons.	Value	Average miles hauled.
Harbors:			
Superior-Duluth.....	52,177,330	\$387,219,625	850
Ashland.....	10,076,703	29,489,599	800
Milwaukee.....	7,925,488	267,155,651	300
Total.....	70,179,511	684,264,875	800
Three rivers:			
Ohio.....	4,000,000	38,773,721	28
Mississippi.....	300,000	Indefinite.	14
Missouri.....	24,000	6,335,313	100
Total.....	4,324,000		23

Appropriations.

	Total.	1918 balances.	Appropriation, this bill.
Three harbors:			
Superior-Duluth.....	\$8,116,028	\$447,002
Ashland.....	644,500	20,876	\$6,000
Milwaukee.....	2,460,475	51,387	12,500
Total.....	11,221,003	519,265	18,500
Three rivers:			
Ohio.....	59,016,463	7,550,164	5,000,000
Mississippi.....	170,000,000	4,500,000	2,412,000
Missouri.....	22,594,591	2,883,162	500,000
Total.....	251,611,060	14,433,326	7,712,000

Three harbors in Wisconsin handled 70,000,000 tons of commerce in 1916 (the last report), valued at about \$700,000,000,

and hauled on an average about 800 miles. Total appropriations for these harbors in past years reached \$11,221,003; balances for 1918 were \$519,265; and this bill carries \$18,500 for 1919. Compared with this, three rivers—the Ohio, Mississippi, and Missouri—floated less than 5,000,000 tons of actual commerce last year, an average distance of only 28 miles, 90 per cent of which commerce was coal, valued at \$2.40 per ton. Total appropriations for the three rivers in past years reached \$251,611,060; balances for 1918 were \$14,433,326; and this bill carries \$7,712,000 more for 1919.

In other words, in 1916 three harbors in one State handled fourteen times as much commerce as our three greatest rivers and carried it twenty-eight times as far, or a ton-mileage of about 400 to 1 in favor of the harbors. On the other hand, the three rivers have cost the Government twenty-two times as much as the harbors, and the river balances on hand are twenty-eight times as great as for the harbors, while this bill carries appropriations for the three rivers four hundred times larger than that carried for the harbors.

The ton-mileage of the three harbors is four hundred times larger than for the rivers, and this bill carries four hundred times more money for the rivers than for the harbors, as stated, and the total appropriations for the rivers are twenty-two times as great as for the three harbors. Can the facts be made plainer?

NOT ONE PROPER TERMINAL ON THE OHIO.

From the minority report it further appears not one proper river terminal exists on the Ohio; only one on the Missouri and three or four on the Mississippi, which are more ornamental than useful. Similar comparisons can be made on other harbors and rivers showing how wasteful and prodigal we have been with the people's money. Hog Island scandals are not the only scandals that need to be probed.

Every river contractor, every private land reclamationist, every private water-power interest, and every other beneficiary is on the job during these war times, as I propose to show, while every farmer and laborer in the fields, shops, mines, and offices is shaking down the old stocking in order to help win the war.

In the bill before us Government engineers have over \$14,000,000 on hand for three rivers with a comparatively small commerce, and yet recommend \$7,712,000 more for the same three rivers. In order to get appropriations for New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, San Francisco, and other harbors that are handling commerce for the war, we must give nearly \$8,000,000 in this bill, or 40 per cent of the whole bill, for three rivers that have been improved for 40 years or more with a decreasing commerce, that have a total navigable length of over 4,000 miles, with only 28 miles average haul.

War grips the world by the throat, and we are calling on every capitalist, every banker, every farmer, and every laborer to do his bit toward winning the war, and any man who is able to contribute and fails to do so is a slacker. All are patriotically doing their part in this great national crisis, and those who divert the money collected for war purposes, in order to prosecute questionable enterprises unrelated to the war, will be called to account by an outraged people. I have no personal quarrel with the man who disagrees on the subject of Government expenditures, but any man who at this juncture fails to disclose public extravagance of which he is cognizant fails to do his duty.

Waterway improvements for actual commerce are necessary in peace as well as war and can not be neglected now or at any other time without hampering legitimate war operations. This applies to waterways that carry actual commerce and includes maintenance of all channels on the rivers used for commerce. It does not include extravagant canalization or dam operations, or land reclamation schemes that have no immediate or early use or possibly any future use, and every dollar so wasted now is indefensible.

THE OHIO RIVER EXTRAVAGANCE.

Five million dollars contained in this bill for the Ohio River is recommended by Government engineers. It is not directly or indirectly related to war purposes. Over \$59,000,000 has been appropriated by the Government for 1,000 miles length of the Ohio River, and during the same time the actual river commerce has greatly diminished, the average lock-and-dam haul is only 28 miles, or one thirty-fifth of the river's length, and apart from coal near the headwaters the commerce is insignificant. A balance of \$7,550,000 was on hand at time of the last report, and according to experience not 5 per cent of that amount is needed for open channel work, the remainder being used for extravagant locks and dams, and yet all these millions will be expended by Government engineers in 1918 and \$5,000,000 more will be filched out of the pockets of

taxpayers in order to continue this carnival of waste on a stream that has not a single municipal terminal along its 1,000 miles of length. The following extract, taken from the report of Maj. John Stewart, Army engineer, dated December 22, 1917, filed with the committee, states:

There are no municipal water terminals along the Ohio River. All terminal facilities are privately owned and are inadequate to properly provide for water transportation of any magnitude and are not constructed or equipped for joint rail-and-water transportation.

Again, he says of a stream that varies 70 feet at different stages:

The towns and cities have sold the privileges of their water gates for a very low rental—some for nothing. In a number of cases the business of the water carrier has been shut off by the municipalities granting unrestricted franchises to the railroads to the right of way along the river front.

Terminal facilities are inadequate and privately owned, practically all river frontage has been sold to railroads or other interests and a 28-mile canalization haul is the net result on a few shaky relics of bygone river glories.

A St. Louis paper takes umbrage because a contract proposed by the Government with Edward F. Goltra, Democratic national committeeman from Missouri, is discussed in the minority the Ohio River after Army engineers have expended over \$50,000,000 in its "improvement."

With seven and a half millions on hand for the Ohio, this bill carries five millions additional that must be extracted from taxpayers during these war times.

Army engineers recommended the amounts contained in this bill, and the Rivers and Harbors Committee has adopted their recommendation in order consistently to follow their advice as to new projects, and Congress is expected to pass this bill as recommended. Not one ton more will be hauled during the war by reason of the \$5,000,000 expenditure, so far as any evidence has been offered. Not one nickel now exacted from the public will be struck from the price of coal.

Private interests have corralled the coal situation on the upper Ohio as elsewhere throughout the country, yet in these days of strict private and public economies we are called upon to carry out the extravagant recommendations of engineers whose predictions of future commerce have not been realized on 2 per cent of the rivers of the country.

THE MISSOURI AND MISSISSIPPI RIVER EXTRAVAGANCES.

I will not discuss in detail the Mississippi or Missouri Rivers, but \$6,883,000 was the balance on hand for these two rivers for 1918, or twelve times the balance reported for the three Wisconsin harbors previously compared, while in 1916 these harbors handled two hundred times as much commerce as the two rivers, and hauled it on an average fifty times as far.

In this bill the Mississippi and Missouri receive \$2,012,000, or one hundred and fifty times as much as the three harbors that handled two hundred times as much commerce.

The cost to the Government, I have demonstrated, is \$60 a ton for Missouri River commerce, which includes floating cordwood valued at \$3 per cord, or about \$1.50 per ton.

It would pay the Government twenty times over to pay all railway freight bills for handling the river commerce, and yet this bill carries a half million dollars more for the Missouri 500,000-acre private land reclamation project that is back of the improvement.

GOVERNMENT PAYS FOR PRIVATE LAND RECLAMATION.

In the minority report it is disclosed that out of \$1,699,000 spent by Government engineers in Missouri last year, 85 per cent was used for private bank protection and 5 per cent for "experimental dredging." That is the purpose for which tax payments are levied during these war times and given to the Missouri River, not for channel work to accommodate the insignificant commerce, but for private land reclamation at Government expense. The official report is undisputed.

We are going to test the navigability of the Mississippi River. Eight years ago we gave \$500,000 to the Army engineers with which to make tests of experimental boats. We have never received any intelligible report from the engineers since that day as to what has been accomplished on this deserted river, but many millions of dollars have followed other millions every year, and our river advisers have been content to squander money for useless dams and other extravagances that are monuments to their skill in wasting money.

About \$120,000,000 has been appropriated for the Mississippi River below the mouth of the Ohio. It is the finest river channel in the world—it has been for years—from St. Louis to New Orleans, but it is a deserted waterway without a single boat line running between the two cities. Only a little local river traffic now remains, and the loss is estimated at 95 per cent compared with the traffic of a half century ago before river improvements were begun.

Fifty million dollars more has been appropriated by Congress for that part of the Mississippi above the mouth of the Ohio, or \$170,000,000 thus far for the greatest inland waterway in the world that is deserted commercially from St. Paul to New Orleans, excepting for an insignificant local traffic carried by report. Mr. Goltra personally appeared before the Rivers and Harbors Committee and explained his proposed contract. The Government is to build for him a couple dozen or more boats at an estimated cost of \$3,360,000—it may cost much more—and turn the boats over to him for his private use on the river at a nominal rental. The boats can not be completed before 1919, possibly not for years, and are not directly or indirectly for war purposes. Mr. Goltra testified before our committee—page 48 of the hearings—that the boats will cost double ordinary prices through being built at this time of high prices, but if he can make a profit by them, he expects to buy them from the Government at half price. If not profitable, they may be scrapped.

HELPING OUT A ST. LOUIS STEEL PLANT.

Mr. Goltra has a steel plant at St. Louis and needs ore, so he proposes to bring ore from St. Paul down to his steel plant and incidentally carry coal up the river, aided by a railroad which he "controls"—page 48 of the hearings. His application, out of many received by the committee, is the only one approved. The only experiment he ever made on the river was last year when he used Government steamboats for towing, for which a small charge was made. The trip cost him \$11,384, over and above receipts, according to his own statement; but he now asks the Government to spend \$3,360,000 for new boats, and he is willing to experiment again for his private steel plant at Government expense.

Hundreds of men and hundreds of interests on the different inland waterways of the country would welcome such a gift from the Government. How and why does it go to Mr. Goltra? What chance has a profiteering concern on Hog Island to make profits compared with a steel plant that "controls" a railway, controls the only contract on the Mississippi, and makes the Government pay the bill? Mr. Goltra has frankly presented his case, but the contract can not be justified, excepting on the ground that his company wants it—and is able to get it.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. How much money was expended out of the Treasury, for the construction, of the funds that were turned over to Mr. Goltra?

Mr. FREAR. There is to be expended \$3,360,000. That is the authorization as stated by Mr. Goltra in the hearings.

Mr. MADDEN. What excuse is given for that?

Mr. FREAR. I have been reading about that. The justification is that he can make an experiment in order to see whether or not he can make a success of it for his business.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman mean to say to the House of Representatives that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has proposed an item—

Mr. FREAR. No; it was not proposed by the River and Harbor Committee. Mr. Goltra voluntarily came before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. We have nothing to do with the contract or appropriation. It is the Shipping Board and this new Waterways Committee that is undertaking to make the contract. His object in coming before us was to satisfy us as to his proposition.

Mr. MADDEN. I have not got it in my head, then. Three million three hundred and sixty thousand dollars is to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States for the construction of boats—

Mr. FREAR. At this time.

Mr. MADDEN. To be turned over to some private individual?

Mr. FREAR. This private plant; Mr. Goltra's; yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Who is to own the boats?

Mr. FREAR. He is to run them, with the privilege of buying them at half price, according to his proposal.

Mr. MADDEN. He is to operate the boats?

Mr. FREAR. He is to operate the boats. They are to be turned over to him for his use exclusively.

Mr. MADDEN. And what does the Government of the United States get?

Mr. FREAR. Two per cent on the investment is the proposition that he made when he came to my office. Four per cent is the suggestion to the committee. He hopes to buy them at one-half price.

Mr. MADDEN. And what would be the interest charge on the money invested?

Mr. FREAR. Two per cent he proposes on the basis of \$3,360,000.

Mr. MADDEN. The cost is to be \$3,360,000, and he will be given an opportunity to buy them at \$1,700,000?

Mr. FREAR. He says that after the war is over they will depreciate in value, and he expects to buy them at \$1,700,000. That is the statement in the hearings.

Mr. MADDEN. Boats in use a couple of years ought to be better than they were the day they were put in the water.

Mr. FREAR. I will leave that to experts like my friend from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. We have had boats in service now for 15 years that are better to-day than they ever were before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 15 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] asks unanimous consent for 15 minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. Is that provided for in this bill?

Mr. FREAR. No. It is not related to this bill. Mr. Goltra was before our committee.

Mr. MADDEN. What fund does it come out of?

Mr. FREAR. It comes out of the Shipping Board fund, as I understand. Out of the \$500,000,000 fund I have understood.

Mr. BOOHER. Is it not a fact that the building of those barges and running them to-day is a public matter, and that Mr. Goltra's offer was to run those boats a certain length of time and see if they could be made profitable?

Mr. FREAR. I will read what the Army engineer says about it.

Mr. BOOHER. I am talking about what Mr. Goltra said about it.

Mr. FREAR. I would rather trust the judgment of an Army engineer instead of Mr. Goltra, who is a party in interest.

Mr. BOOHER. Did any Army engineer ever report anything of the kind about that matter?

Mr. FREAR. Yes. I have read that in the RECORD, and I want to finish another point before concluding. I have read that to the House. I want to finish another point now.

Mr. BOOHER. I want to get this right. The Rivers and Harbors Committee has had nothing to do with that contract.

Mr. FREAR. I stated that repeatedly.

Mr. BOOHER. It was done by the Shipping Board.

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. In an effort to determine whether or not barges could be run on the Mississippi River.

Mr. FREAR. No. It was given by the Shipping Board to Mr. Goltra for his own private interest. There has not been any attempt to do it generally. The engineer says it can only be a test for his business.

Mr. BOOHER. Where do you get the authority for that?

Mr. FREAR. I have got it in the hearing.

Mr. BOOHER. Was there any such evidence as that adduced before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors?

Mr. FREAR. In that hearing the engineer said it was given for Mr. Goltra's special interest, and that no other business, in his judgment, on the upper Mississippi could be made profitable.

Mr. BOOHER. I want to set the gentleman right on that matter.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, I have already quoted the book and the page.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FREAR. In a moment.

Mr. BOOHER. You did not quote from Col. Keller's testimony?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; I quoted from Col. Keller's testimony.

Mr. BOOHER. You say he said that was the only one?

Mr. FREAR. I said he said Mr. Goltra was the only one who was given the opportunity to make the test, and that in his judgment he was the only one who could make it profitable.

Now, I can not yield more unless you give me more time. I have made my statement fairly, and I have repeated it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is it not a fact that the Shipping Board has also recommended an appropriation of \$20,000,000 to buy barges to take coal from the Alabama mines on the Black Warrior River, which is to furnish power on the Muscle Shoals to New Orleans?

Mr. FREAR. Yes. I wanted to refer to that. I was going to talk about Muscle Shoals, but the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] who has just spoken has referred to Muscle Shoals. He presented it so strongly last

night that all I ask is to add a brief word in regard to it later.

MILLIONS OF DOLLARS FOR QUESTIONABLE CONTRACTS.

But these extravagances are modest compared with others. By a singular coincidence another \$21,000,000 has been recommended by Charles Montecón and A. J. Mason, special examiners for the Shipping Board, who urge the building of 100 steel barges and towboats by the Government for the Warrior River to accommodate parties interested in Alabama mines. The announcement was made by the press during the present month. Private capital refuses to put boats on the Warrior just as it refuses to put boats on the Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio, so the Government is advised by its own agents to give \$21,000,000 for boats for the Warrior, in addition to \$12,000,000 for dams and locks already spent through the River and Harbor Committee on a deserted river. The same amount—\$21,000,000—was the estimate of Hog Island's carnival of money waste. The actual cost is nearly double. Underestimates are sure to follow in every case.

Why put \$33,000,000 in the Warrior River, way down in the wilds of Alabama, and not one dollar in the New York Barge Canal? Who pays the \$42,000,000 that is to be extracted from the Federal Treasury in 1918 for the Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, and Warrior Rivers, and why?

THE MUSCLE SHOALS ALSO GOES OVER THE TOP.

Yesterday the Muscle Shoals lock and dam proposal, also in Alabama on the Tennessee River, was agreed upon out of some of the numerous funds Congress has provided for war activities. This item first appeared, recommended by Army engineers, in the river and harbor bill of 1915 for \$18,700,000, with an initial appropriation. When exposed, the project was stricken out of the bill by the House and never dared again to invite disaster through that committee recommendation.

Like a crafty shell game, it has been practically impossible to keep trace of this elusive power scheme, which has been stricken out of bill after bill, but, through the cooperation of Government agencies, finally bobs up again serenely. Its estimated cost now is from \$20,000,000 to \$100,000,000, a mere bagatelle; the time to build is several years, and after having been urged for navigation, nitrates, fertilizer, and always for power, we find its power of pull is finally supreme. By a coincidence it is also down in Alabama, where the powerful Muscle Shoals and profiteering warriors grow.

SMALL RIVER EXTRAVAGANCE.

It may be absurd to point out in detail comparatively small extravagances in this bill, like the \$500,000 item for a deserted \$6,000,000 section of the Norfolk-Beaufort Canal, or \$343,000 carried in this bill for locks and dams on the Tennessee in addition to \$1,087,743 balance on hand, according to the Engineer's reports, or to the \$500,000 item for locks and dams on the Allegheny, and other items unrelated to the war or present commerce found in the river and harbor bill before us.

Why question hundreds of thousands of dollars here or there throughout the bill when over \$60,000,000, largely of wasted money, not related to the prosecution of the war, is to be filched from the Public Treasury for five rivers? Why permit profiteering for every conceivable purpose, from shipbuilding contracts and shoddy-uniform contracts down to private fleets, private-land reclamation, and water-power schemes, all at Government expense?

Mr. Chairman, we are engaged in a great war. Practically every man, from the stripling in school to the battle-scarred veteran of the Civil War, is pulling to win the war. Only a few profiteering or political patriots or egoists are promiscuously slandering the loyalty of their fellow countrymen, while practically every man, woman, and child is engaged in Red Cross or other war service, and all are rigidly observing rules of self-denial, down to wheatless, meatless, and heatless days.

PATRIOTISM VERSUS PROFITEERING.

War is a serious business, and the American people are putting every ounce of strength into the war. They are subscribing to the limit for liberty loans and war certificates. Mothers are sending their most precious treasures, their own sons, to France to help win the war. All are doing nobly and all are terribly in earnest. We have passed the time for lip loyalty or political patriotism, and sacrifice is the keynote of every community and every household.

SOME ACID TESTS ON EXTRAVAGANCE.

Ringling denunciation against extravagance comes from the lips of an able Democratic leader, Mr. Sisson, of Mississippi, who said on the House floor in debate:

I must apologize to you Republicans for having ever used the words "criminally extravagant" in criticizing the appropriations that you made, for if that expression "criminally extravagant" was proper to apply to you, my God the English language has never found an adjective strong enough to apply to Democratic extravagance.

Mr. Sisson was not questioning war appropriations, but waste.

Again, a heart-stirring denunciation against Treasury looting from the distinguished Democratic leader, Mr. Fitzgerald, of New York, rings in our ears:

Whenever I think of the horrible mess that I shall be called upon to present to the country on behalf of the Democratic Party, I am tempted to quit my place. * * * If I placed my political fortunes above my sworn duty under the law, I would not attempt to carry out the promises of the Democratic platform, but I should place myself at the head of this band of Treasury looters upon every occasion.

Pursuant to that threat Mr. Fitzgerald resigned from the House, and on the day he bid good-by—December 14, 1917—Chairman KITCHIN, leader of the Democratic majority, feelingly said of pork appetites:

I sometimes fear that too many of our colleagues set up as the true measure of service here the amount of money which they can filch out of the Treasury into their districts and States for creeks or rivers or public buildings.

Let the record of public extravagance, unrelated to war measures, rest with the testimony of prominent Democratic administration leaders of the House, either in opposition to unfair division of pork on the one hand or against "Treasury looting" on the other, according to statements submitted. And these three fearless Democratic leaders voted against the prewar "acid tests" offered by the President.

OVER \$100,000,000 STRICKEN FROM BILLS.

In opposition to the votes and protests of some of these same leaders, a vigorous onslaught has been made year after year, beginning with 1914 against pork-barrel bills, with the result that over \$100,000,000 has been saved to the taxpayers of the country through defeat or reductions in these vicious bills.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. No.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I think I will ask for a quorum.

Mr. FREAR. All right. You can call for a quorum if you want to.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

Mr. FREAR. I refuse to yield, whether the gentleman does that or not.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. You can not do it unless there is a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point that there is no quorum present.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to continue my remarks.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman can not break in while the gentleman from Wisconsin has the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Texas is in order in calling for a quorum.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that he withdraw his point of no quorum.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. The object I had in view was that inasmuch as the gentleman from Wisconsin had such a large audience at the beginning of his remarks he ought to have a quorum at the close. I have no disposition to curtail the remarks of the gentleman, and I therefore withdraw my point of order. [Laughter.]

Mr. FREAR. I thank the gentleman. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the Record, and will then continue.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is little better in character than its predecessors, although it has \$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000 carved off from the usual hoghead dimensions. Only about \$8,000,000 of the present bill is for the five rivers described. The remaining \$54,000,000 is through the Shipping Board or other new agencies.

Not one of the \$60,000,000 to \$100,000,000 extravagances on the five rivers pointed out in the foregoing statement is for war purposes. At a time when selfish interests are concealing their purposes by shouting their loyalty from the housetops, we need many Fitzgeralds, Sissons, and KITCHINS to scourge the money changers from the temple, not alone from the Capitol but

wherever unconscionable profiteering exists under the Government. Let the slogan be, "Billions to win the war, but not one penny for profiteering."

Against this striking record we find only nominal taxes placed on great wealth, although we have repeatedly promised to conscript wealth even as we have conscripted the youth and man power of the land to win the war.

WE MUST MORE THAN DOUBLE WAR-PROFITS TAXES.

Great Britain levies a tax on war profits of 80 per cent, while our own tax of 30 per cent is abnormally modest. I have confined my remarks to wasted millions in 1918 on five rivers, without discussing general extravagance, but I annex a brief statement of enormous profits made by a couple of score of business interests out of hundreds that could be named as an appropriate supplement to a Government gift for a specially favored steel plant owned by Mr. Goltra, Democratic committeeman.

With this statement I leave responsibility for present extravagances, which, according to Representative Sisson, can not fitly be described by the English language.

Public expenditures are being met by bond issues or taxation. It is estimated that American corporations in 1917 made in war profits in excess of their average profits during pre-war years approximately \$3,600,000,000. During a time when our boys are fighting at the front and every citizen at home is called upon to contribute liberally to the support of the war these unconscionable profits can not be defended and should be reached by rigorous taxation to help meet war expenditures. It would serve to curb extravagance and inflation that thrives on bond issues. I append a few specific cases of war profits in 1916 which convey their own argument:

War profits of a few concerns out of thousands reported.

	Average net income, pre-war period (1911-12-13).	War profits, 1916.	Net war profits, 1916.
COPPER.			
American Smelting & Refining Co.....	\$9,060,396	\$22,152,250	\$13,091,854
Anaconda Copper Mining Co.....	11,741,185	58,892,980	47,151,795
Butte & Sup. Mining Co.....	942,988	8,873,446	7,930,458
California & Arizona Copper Co.....	2,966,634	11,155,094	8,188,070
Greene Can. Copper Co.....	1,407,902	3,435,879	2,027,077
Miami Copper Co.....	1,296,602	7,759,784	6,463,182
Nevada Consolidated Copper Co.....	3,419,265	15,419,268	11,582,785
Phelps-Dodge Corporation.....	7,442,399	21,974,263	14,531,864
Ray Consolidated Co.....	1,634,665	11,716,428	10,082,063
Utah Copper Co.....	7,723,435	39,738,675	32,005,240
Total, 10 companies.....	47,635,772	200,700,763	153,055,288
LEATHER.			
American Hide & Leather Co.....	334,198	1,643,280	1,309,082
Central Leather Co.....	3,473,804	15,489,202	12,016,398
Total, 2 companies.....	3,808,002	17,132,482	13,325,480
MEAT.			
Armour & Co.....	4,746,642	20,100,000	15,352,368
Morris & Co.....	1,588,799	3,632,213	2,043,414
Swift & Co.....	7,879,167	20,465,000	12,585,833
Wilson & Co.....	1,344,926	4,915,872	3,568,947
Total, 4 companies.....	15,559,534	49,113,085	33,550,562
OIL.			
Standard Oil:			
California.....	9,877,964	17,605,304	7,727,340
Indiana.....	14,687,695	30,043,614	15,355,918
Kentucky.....	1,002,453	2,068,598	1,066,140
New York.....	16,212,985	36,638,495	20,425,510
Total Standard Oil (4).....	41,781,103	86,355,011	44,574,908
Texas Co. (The).....	3,856,667	13,898,882	10,042,195
Total, 5 companies.....	45,637,770	100,254,893	54,617,103
POWDER.			
Du Pont Powder Co.....	5,525,964	82,107,693	76,581,529
Hercules Powder Co.....	1,017,212	16,658,873	15,641,661
Atlas Powder Co.....	322,837	2,939,839	2,616,952
Total, 3 companies.....	6,866,013	101,706,405	94,840,342
PAPER.			
American Writing Paper.....	126,430	2,524,378	2,397,948
International Paper Co.....	1,105,913	4,020,727	3,514,814
Total, 2 companies.....	1,231,343	7,145,105	5,811,762
RUBBER.			
Ajax Rubber Co.....	348,196	1,268,311	920,115
Goodrich Rubber Co.....	3,040,745	9,447,299	6,406,554
United States Rubber Co.....	6,661,777	11,226,208	4,564,431
Total, 3 companies.....	10,050,718	21,941,818	11,891,100

War profits of a few concerns out of thousands reported—Continued.

	Average net income, pre-war period (1911-12-13).	War profits, 1916.	Net war profits, 1916.
STEEL.			
Allis-Chalmers Co.....	\$755,125	\$3,165,020	\$2,409,895
American Locomotive Co.....	3,872,807	10,709,429	6,836,622
Bethlehem Steel Corporation.....	3,075,108	43,593,568	40,518,460
Crucible Steel Co.....	3,629,467	13,223,656	9,594,189
Lackawanna Steel Co.....	1,282,500	12,218,234	10,935,734
Republic Iron & Steel Co.....	2,265,694	14,789,162	12,523,468
United States Steel Corporation.....	63,585,777	271,531,730	207,945,953
Total, 7 companies.....	78,466,478	369,290,799	290,824,721
SUGAR.			
American Beet Sugar Co.....	1,246,650	6,126,677	4,880,027
American Sugar Refining Co.....	5,751,688	8,319,882	2,568,194
Cuban American Sugar Co.....	409,988	8,235,112	7,825,124
Total, 3 companies.....	7,408,326	22,681,671	15,273,345
WOOL.			
American Woolen Co.....	1,754,792	5,681,671	4,109,026
Total, 40 companies.....	218,418,748	895,830,819	677,298,729

¹ Col. Goltra's company and associated interests are not included in the above, but will be found among the many thousands of corporations that necessarily are omitted from the list.

Mr. SMALL. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think under the circumstances that it was proper for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] to make some remarks about his State, and I agree that Wisconsin is a great American State. The gentleman, however, has charged up to the Democratic administration a mysterious and unsigned circular published over in the State of Illinois and floating about somewhere for political purposes.

Mr. FREAR. If the gentleman will yield, I do not believe that the President of the United States knew anything about that. I am sure of that.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. FREAR. Why, certainly.

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not know who issued that appeal to the soldiers, but I do know that it is not necessary to make an appeal to the American soldier to cast a loyal vote, because he can be counted on to cast a loyal vote; and whether Members in this House or the other branch measure squarely up to the standard of American loyalty, the soldier can not pass upon that question effectively until he is called upon to vote. The Bible tells us that "by their fruits ye shall know them." A man may say that he is a patriot, but he may do things and say things that do not square with his statement. Now, there are gentlemen in this House and some in the other branch of Congress who, according to my judgment, have not measured fully up to the standard of complete loyalty.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman think it would be wise to let other people decide what they should do, and each man be responsible for his own actions, without some one man trying to become the critic of the actions of every other man?

Mr. HEFLIN. That is not my purpose. I have the right to criticize the conduct of Members here, and I invite their criticism of my conduct. Last year, Mr. Chairman, after this Government had solemnly declared a state of war to exist, after the President of the United States had called the boys of our country to the colors, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] introduced in this House a measure which would have tied the hands of the President and left him without authority to use our military forces against Germany on the battle fields of Europe. When the battle was raging in Europe, when the greatest enemy of mankind was in the field with his forces, struggling to overcome Europe and then to come and invade this country, I repeat, the gentleman from Illinois introduced a measure in this House which would have stopped the President with his Army at the ocean side and left this Government puny any helpless, humiliated and ridiculous before the world. I did not think that his conduct on that occasion was in keeping with the spirit of true Americanism. We had declared war and we had laid down a war program, we were mobilizing our forces and moving to the battle field to meet the bloody-handed monarch of the Old World. I was disposed, gentlemen of the House, to let that un-American act go by; and when this Congress reassembled, after stating here last year that some gentlemen's

conduct did not square with my idea of their duty as patriotic Members of Congress, and I discussed the matter with Members of the House and decided to let that matter rest unless something else was done or said which needed attention. But on the 7th day of February, in this House, this same gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason] made a speech of 30 minutes and then extended his remarks in the RECORD, all in criticism of this Government and its position in the war. There was not one word of abuse in it for Germany. There was criticism in it of our allies, but nothing against Germany, the arch enemy of mankind. About the only thing that he said in which I could locate him definitely was, "For God's sake, let us quit quarreling among ourselves and fight the Kaiser." But strange to say, after that he branched off and said, "Since the secret peace treaties have been published"—and I thought he was speaking by authority, that he was about to disclose to us facts that he had obtained at the State Department. I did not know that he was bringing here and putting into this RECORD stuff published by the hired agents of Germany and the bolsheviks, their hirelings in Russia. I made investigation at the State Department, and they said, "No; we have nothing about any such secret treaty except from that source" that I have mentioned. But the gentleman says, "That according to these so-called secret peace treaties we find that our English cousins and our French allies and Russia were going to slice up Germany." That suggestion is in his speech. I know that it passed the notice of many patriotic Republicans on that side as it passed the notice of many patriotic Democrats on this side. And I want to say here in passing that there are some as brave and patriotic Republicans on that side as ever stood beneath the flag. I pay you that compliment, because you are entitled to it. There are but few on either side who do not stand square up to the standard in either branch. But the gentleman criticized the position of our Government. He talks here about these mysterious secret treaties, while our boys are over there fighting to preserve democracy and liberty, to preserve the American Republic. We are trying to make the world safe for America to live in, and for our children to live in long after we are dead. The gentleman insinuates that the secret treaties between our allies, which they deny, disclose the fact that they have a bargain between themselves, and that they are fighting to slice up Germany. No, gentlemen, I do not propose that this RECORD shall become the vehicle to carry over the country the propaganda of the enemy. This RECORD should not be used for that purpose, and I have a right as you have to pass upon things said here to see whether or not they square with true Americanism. Now, what else? The gentleman makes a fling at Japan. About that time Japan, it is said, was here asking our Government what she could do to aid the great forces of civilization in this war. But the gentleman's speech is a fling at Japan, and accuses her of having a secret treaty with somebody to fight America at some future time. At a time when we ought to have been sounding every word that suggested harmony and unity that would bring to our aid every force that sympathized with us, a Member stands on this floor and antagonizes a nation in sympathy with the allies and speaks in this solemn place that which can be circulated by German agents in this country who will say, "See what you Americans are fighting for; you are not fighting to preserve the Republic, you are fighting to help England, France, and Russia slice up Germany."

What else? Why, in another place in that speech the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason] said that we would not have any riots in this country, that the people have not had a chance to speak on the question of life and death, and the reason that there will be no riots is that they know that in the cool, quiet days of November they will speak. What does he mean by that? That the American people are not with their Government; that this Congress has instituted a program and is backing up the leader of this Nation in a way contrary to the wishes of the people? What does he mean when he says that they will not riot, because they know that in the cool and quiet days of November they will speak? Is that an insinuation that they are going to indorse the program? No, gentlemen, it is an insinuation that they will repudiate it. What else can you make of it? Further on in that speech the gentleman says that our mothers are interested in this matter—and they are, God bless them—they are giving their sons heroically to the cause of their country; and following that statement the gentleman says that no woman who has been through the high school ever knew boys conscripted before to settle the title to real estate in Europe. What does he mean by that? Before what time? Now, what are they doing now? Fighting to settle the title to real estate in Europe? That is the inference obtained from the statement of the gentleman from Illinois. "No girl who has been through the high school ever saw boys conscripted before to

fight abroad to settle the title to real estate in Europe." God of our fathers, move upon the State of Illinois! She has some as brave and patriotic Representatives here as ever lived. Fighting to settle the title to real estate in Europe! This Nation that we love never drew the sword except in the cause of right and liberty; she has no ancient hate to gratify and no lust for power impelled her to the battle field, but it was the love of right, of liberty, and justice that caused her to draw the sword; and yet the gentleman from Illinois would throw her cause lightly aside and say that our boys are being conscripted to settle the title to real estate in Europe.

In another place the gentleman says, "Let us look this thing squarely in the face; no dodging. The only thing that stands between us and honorable peace," he continues, "is the disposition of Alsace-Lorraine." Ah, gentlemen of the House, I regret that those words have been uttered by one honored with a seat in this body. We never thought of Alsace-Lorraine when Germany shot down our flag, destroyed our commerce, and murdered our citizens. No, gentlemen, the disposition of Alsace-Lorraine never entered our minds. When France sent her brave and heroic army to fight that immortal battle at the Marne she was not thinking of Alsace-Lorraine; she was thinking and fighting to save the life of the French Republic. The gentleman suggests that the truth is that the disposition of Alsace-Lorraine is the only thing that stands between us and honorable peace. Why? Because he says that we have achieved what we wanted when we entered the war—a free sea, that the belligerents have agreed to. Germany agreeing to it? Did not Germany come and lay her hand upon the open Bible, as it were, and tell the President that she was not going to murder any more of our women and children or sink any more ships without giving them warning, and that she would help us to keep an open sea, and also that she would not disturb noncontraband commerce between neutral nations? And did she keep the faith? No. Did she break it? Yes; she said it was a mere "scrap of paper"; that she did not regard it as binding upon her honor; and now, with her hands dripping with the blood of women and children of America, France, and Belgium, with all the crimes and cruelties committed against France and Belgium, with all these crimes at the door of Germany, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason] would have us say to the Kaiser, "Do you agree to give us a free sea?" and that murderous monarch should answer "Yes," then he would have us lay down our arms and go home, and then the Kaiser would wake up next morning and start his bloody butchery afresh, finish up the European countries, and come and fight us when there would be no ally to stand and help us fight.

That is not all, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman goes on in that speech and suggests that we discuss peace. Discuss peace now. For three years the President talked peace all the time. He had an olive branch in one hand and the dove of peace in the other, but the Kaiser brushed him aside with his mailed hand and would not listen to him. Then the Kaiser drew this Government into war by his own brutal and murderous act, and this Government, under its matchless leader, said to the American people, "Go and conserve the food supply, go tell the good housewives of America that we must conserve the food supply, go tell the farmers that we must make a bumper crop to feed ourselves and our allies," and the agricultural army is in motion; "take over the railroad lines of the country," and that was done; "appropriate billions for war purposes," and that is done; "summon 10,000,000 of men and put them on the roll, this the fighting force of the country," and that is done; and the President says, "The flag and the battle field now." But the gentleman from Illinois says, "Halt your forces; it is barbarous not to stop and discuss peace terms. Here stands this war-mad monarch, who wants to talk peace with us; let us stop and parley with him." The President says, "He did that in Russia; that was his propaganda there," and poor, distracted Russia stands humiliated and despoiled before the world. But still the gentleman insists that "it will be barbarous not to stop and discuss peace terms with Germany." God of our fathers! What are we coming to in this body? Do you know what was done with that speech? It was printed in the RECORD and then put into pamphlet form and circulated over the country. There is not a clear-ringing American note in it; there is nothing in it that exalts the American cause; there is no tribute to the merit, the virtue, and courage of the allied armies. There is in it no stricture upon the brutal German horde, not one. What was the purpose of that speech? Was it intended to help America? If the gentleman, when making that speech, was standing for our cause, "then cast me back into pagan night, to take my chances with Socrates for bliss than be the Christian of a faith like this!" But that is not all that the gentleman said. Talk peace! Yes; and the Kaiser suggested that we talk peace. The gentleman says in another

part of his speech that there is a party that says no peace without victory. He did not even tell us that it was the Kaiser who said that recently. The Kaiser not only said no peace without victory but no peace until it is achieved by German arms and acknowledged by our allies. That is the substance of his statement, and yet this Hall is the forum for the delivery of such a speech and this Record the vehicle to carry it over the country. All this, Mr. Chairman, while our boys—God bless them—are going forth to fight and to die for our country. Gentlemen, I serve notice on you now, on both sides of the aisle, I am a humble Member of this body, but I do not intend, as long as I serve here, that this body shall become the forum and this Record the vehicle to spread German propaganda through the country.

Mr. Chairman, there is another gentleman here from Illinois, Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. BRITTEN introduced a resolution or an amendment which exempted boys of German and Austrian blood from service in the United States Army against Germany.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, that is absolutely false. The gentleman does not recall correctly my statement.

Mr. HEFLIN. The gentleman will not apply any such epithet to me inside of this House or outside of it. I stated that the gentleman introduced a measure which gave to boys of German blood, every one of them, and every boy of Austrian blood an opportunity to get out of the service in a foreign country in the war against Germany. Is not that so?

Mr. BRITTEN. I do not recognize the gentleman in the House or in the street, but I will say to the chairman of the committee that his last statement is correct.

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not permit the Member from Illinois to interrupt me in this manner.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman asked a question and I supposed he wanted an answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not yield to the Member from Illinois, that is my language. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman introduced a bill or measure putting it in the hands of every boy of German blood to come up to the President and say, "I do not want to fight in this war against Germany. My father came over here to live, it is true. I was born here, my father has accumulated this world's goods here, and I am an American citizen, but I do not want to fight for the United States against Germany." Mr. Chairman, is not that an awful thing? My God, in all the glorious history of this Republic that anybody from anywhere should want exemption from her service is more than I can understand. If George Washington had said, "Exempt me from service against the mother country, I am an Englishman," we might have no Republic to-day. Now, the gentleman from Illinois introduced this bill that I am telling you about. There is a copy of it here somewhere; I thought I had it, some of the Members had it yesterday. It exempted boys of German and Austrian blood from service in the war against Germany. They were not to go out of this country if they did not want to go. Other boys could go, but Germany and Austria, the deadly enemies of our country, are favored especially by a Member of this House. I would not have been surprised if that bill had been introduced in the German Reichstag, but I was surprised that it was introduced in the American House of Representatives. I hold here a statement issued this year by Mr. Harre, of the Council of Defense, or the American Defense Society, who talks about this bill and said that Viereck, the traitor in New York, who was the editor of the Fatherland, notoriously against this Government, notoriously in sympathy with Germany, that—

On the afternoon of June 25, the day upon which this bill was introduced by Congressman BRITTEN, of Illinois, Mr. Viereck read to me the text of the bill proposing that citizens of German or Austrian birth or descent upon their request should be exempted from military service in foreign lands.

So then—

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield? By whom is that issued, what society?

Mr. HEFLIN. By T. Everett Harre, and these extracts are signed by the secretary of the American Defense Society. Now, gentlemen, what do you think of that—that Viereck wrote that bill. Did he send it to the Member from Illinois? How came that bill here? How came it to be introduced in this body? Those are questions that we must consider; while our boys are fighting at the front we must not fail to do our duty here. [Applause.] If our boys have the courage to go over yonder and fight for the flag, let us have courage to do our duty here, it matters not how unpleasant it may be. I recall that this same Member from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] said here last year that Members of Congress would not speak to me when they met me

on the street. There is not one word of truth in that statement. No Member of this House that I care to speak to has ever failed to speak to me, and I speak to the most of them, I am glad to say. I stand well with most of them and they with me, and if any man does not want to speak to me he compliments my patriotism by not speaking, because I stand square to every wind that blows about that flag. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have just received a copy of the Britten bill. It says:

Citizens of German or Austrian birth or descent, selected for draft in the military service, may, upon their own request, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President, be assigned to military or naval service on American soil or in American waters, or directed for duty in such industries including agriculture—

Oh, yes, God bless them, service out in the field of agriculture—

found to be necessary to the maintenance of the military establishment or the effective operation of the military forces or the maintenance of national interests during the emergency.

God of our fathers, I repeat, "Germany and Austria," American boys of that blood may be excused from service, but come on you boys of Scotch or Irish origin, of French, Italian, Hebrew, or English extraction, and all of the other brave blood of our country and go to the front. But these citizens of German and Austrian blood are the chosen. They are the objects of our special favor, because they do not want to fight against their kindred who are trying to destroy the Republic.

Gentlemen, if that is Americanism, I can not subscribe to the doctrine. If that is loyalty to the boys at the front and to the flag, then I am not loyal myself.

And, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois got up here yesterday and told the world where all of our boys in the marine service were located, just how many were down here, 9,000 of them, and so many yonder, and so many over yonder. Germany has been trying to find out how many men we have moved across the sea and how many are still at home. The gentleman did not intend to give out that information, of course. German spies have tried to find out where our Cavalry horses were located. They found 500 of them in Kentucky and they poisoned them.

If you have criticism to make, gentlemen, go to the President, to the Secretary of War, to the Secretary of the Navy, and make known your complaint to them, where no German spy will get hold of it. Do not let spies get hold of something that they can use to the injury of our country.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] quoted Mr. REED, of Missouri. Mr. REED, of Missouri, is an able man, but he is not my guide either in democracy or patriotism. [Applause.] Another man over there said the other day that we had not sent any aeroplanes abroad. That very day we were shipping them to France, and that very afternoon three American boys were shooting down three German aeroplanes above the battle lines in France. That is what is going on. Some men are hindering us and helping the enemy. And in God's name they ought to quit it.

Let me say this in conclusion. I am trying to do my patriotic duty, although it is an unpleasant thing to do sometimes. I rejoice that Wisconsin has shown to the world that she is loyal. I never had a doubt about that. There are some people in that State, however, who are not loyal. Do not tell me that a bunch that will march up to the polls behind that fellow Berger, indicted by the court for seditious conduct and wanting us to call our Army home and crawl before the Kaiser, is loyal. [Applause.]

I will tell you another thing, gentlemen; I know a body that is not a mile away from here which would render great service to itself and to the country if it would expel a Senator that I know. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] by his speech on yesterday caused me to bring the Britten bill, to exempt boys of German and Austrian blood from service, to the attention of the country. The Bible tells us that "by their fruits ye shall know them," and that "as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." And also that "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." So I must judge these men by what they do and say, and if I believe them to be wrong I am going to call their names.

Now, let me say in conclusion, God bless this great American Union. Gentlemen, we are a peculiar people. God Almighty gathered here under this flag the persecuted men and women of every clime and country, and America does not ask anybody from what country he comes. She only asks whether he is a loyal American citizen. Citizens of German blood, and there are thousands of them here who are as loyal as anybody, and brave boys of German blood are fighting under our flag in Europe to-day, owe it to their children to repudiate all acts

on the part of public men that put them in the attitude of crawling around and wanting to be exempt from the service of their country in the hour of its peril.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. I would like to have two minutes more.

Mr. BOOHER. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. HEFLIN. Now, gentlemen, let me say in conclusion, let us stand together and all together by the President, this great American, the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. [Applause.] Away with the things that divide us. Honest criticism is all right; but I want to tell you this: I do not care whether the man is a Democrat or a Republican, the Member will not speak here two minutes before I know where his heart is. He may say, "I am with the President and I am with the country, but, and if." Do you know what President Lincoln said about that, gentlemen? He said, "Beware of the fellow who says, 'I am with you, but, and if'; he is not right down here in his heart." That is what Lincoln said. In this trying time let there be nothing here but real Americanism. Let us make true Americanism the paramount issue and complete American loyalty the supreme test. [Applause.]

And, now, let me say of Illinois, God bless that historic old State. In her soil sleeps the sacred dust of the martyred Lincoln. God knows, if he could have been spared, the South would have been spared the horrors of reconstruction. No section of the country suffered as much as the South on account of the blow of the assassin's bullet. Some months ago Gov. Lowden, of Illinois, said to the legislature of that State: "It is my duty and yours and the duty of the people of Illinois to get wholeheartedly behind our Commander in Chief." God bless the patriotic governor of Illinois. [Applause.] I served with him in this House, and he is my personal friend. He was the first governor in our union of States to call the State legislature to the standard of the Nation. How fitting and appropriate, gentlemen, that the governor of the Commonwealth of Illinois, in whose bosom sleeps the dust of the martyred Lincoln, should be first to come forward with the colors of his State entwined about the standard of the Union. [Applause.] This is the centennial year of the great State of Lincoln; 100 years ago she took her place in the great sisterhood of American States. Illinois, bright daughter of the Nation, well may you lift up your voice and be glad when on this proud anniversary of your birth time he who holds the highest office within your gift crowns you with the glory of unadulterated Americanism. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the Member who just preceded me [Mr. HEFLIN] said, "By their fruits, so shall ye know them." It makes me weary, this canned and pickled patriotism that the House is subjected to from time to time by a certain number of gentlemen who are continually winding themselves about with the American flag for fear that the country will not know that they are patriotic.

"By their fruits, so shall ye know them." If I had voted in past years against every naval appropriation and against every military appropriation that was intended to put our country in a state of preparedness I also would want to stand around on this floor and continue to wave the flag about myself to convey to the people of the country the idea that I am patriotic at last, notwithstanding the fact that I had attempted to throttle every increase in the Army and the Navy during my term of service in Congress. I would continue to yell "flag" and "patriotism" and "loyalty" until the very heavens reeked with my voice and the people of my country had forgotten my misguided conduct. I would be ashamed of having voted the way I had in times gone by. I would continue to bray, and bray, and bray about patriotism and about that flag, and then crow like a barnyard rooster about what I was going to do, now that we have gotten into this war.

It is not necessary for a Member of Congress to continually roll himself in the American flag in order to induce people to believe that he is patriotic, that he is loyal. He is known by his fruits, as the Bible says, and as the Member who just preceded me repeated.

In the annual Navy bill of 1912, before I was a Member of this House, a motion was made to build but one battleship, notwithstanding that the Navy General Board, presided over by the late Admiral George Dewey, had recommended to the Congress that four first-line battleships be built that year. Is

it not quite ridiculous to recall that these very spellbinders of patriotism, these wasters of valuable time telling of their own loyalty while the House should be considering important war legislation, including the Member from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], voted against even one first-line fighting ship; and there was none authorized that year.

On February 26, 1913, the self-styled patriots of to-day voted to reduce a two-battleship bill to only one battleship, and again, on March 3, 1913, their votes permitted the building of but one battleship, notwithstanding the Navy General Board's recommendation of that year for six first-line ships.

I could go down the line and recite vote after vote for military as well as naval preparedness up to the very moment that we entered the war and these new patriots are always found on the side opposed to real preparedness. If they had had their way, we would to-day have no first-line fighting ships, and our military, small and weak as it was a year ago when we entered the war, could not have been found with a microscope.

Perhaps I am inconsiderate and it is necessary for them to bray their patriotism whenever possible. Their conscience may bother them now that they see the folly of their votes and we are into a world's war, with every ounce of our capabilities about to be taxed.

They habitually refused to vote for preparedness legislation recommended by the Navy General Board, the General Staff of the Army, the Navy League, the Security League, and other purely patriotic societies. It will take a lot of talking and wasting of valuable time to bring our people to recognize the sincerity of these noisy flag wielders.

The speaker who just preceded me tried to ridicule a resolution which I introduced last year that would exempt, upon their request, certain American citizens who still had warm and fresh blood ties in Germany and Austria from going across, under certain rules and regulations to be prescribed by the President. What the speaker said in opposition to my resolution also applies in opposition to the order sent out by the President on March 22 to the Secretary of War, telling him that certain rules should be provided for conscientious objectors to combatant service abroad. The President said they should be given a wide range of military duties from which to select, that were not combatant, in order that they might be used to the very best of their ability and their efficiency in the National Army. And, gentlemen, that is exactly what my resolution intended—to increase the efficiency of the Army, to make our soldiers at the front more dependable; and whatever the previous speaker just said in opposition to my resolution applies equally against the order just sent by the President, the distinguished gentleman at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, to the Secretary of War. So much for that.

The previous speaker referred to a statement having been issued by the Council of National Defense, which he afterwards corrected and said it was the American Defense Society.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. BRITTEN. The American Defense Society did send this statement out, a copy of which was forwarded to me by my clipping bureau, and one from Mr. Vierick, of New York, the gentleman referred to as having boasted of writing my bill, to Mr. T. Everett Harre, the author of the article. Mr. Vierick said the statement was a complete falsehood and he was ready and willing at all times to take oath to that effect.

This society is composed of such gentlemen as Col. Roosevelt, Dr. David Jayne Hill, former ambassador to Germany, Hon. Robert Bacon, Mr. Hudson Maxim, and many other equally distinguished Americans. It did me the honor of placing my name on its public "roll of honor" because of my consistent endeavor in the direction of "preparedness," alongside of such names as our dear former colleague, the late "Gussie" Gardner, and Capt. Richmond P. Hobson, from your side of the House.

We have stood for preparedness measures at all times, whether they were for the military or the Navy. And the Lord knows, five or six years ago it was lots of trouble to pass even a one-battleship program bill through this House, because of men like you, who wanted no preparedness of any kind.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. That is, the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, I do not care to mention the gentleman's name.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, what does the Member mean by that last remark?

Mr. BRITTEN. I have my own way of designating you.

Mr. HEFLIN. You will do it in a respectful way as long as you are in this House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken. The gentleman should not interrupt without rising from his seat.

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that no speaker has a right to point his finger at anybody and refer to him as "you."

Mr. BRITTEN. My friend is correct. I was about to withdraw that; I do not wish to be disrespectful of the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman; and I am sorry that it occurred. Of course, I immediately realized that a mistake had been made, and that the society would rectify it to its fullest ability. I exchanged several letters with the society, with the result that a statement is about to be issued which will clear the entire matter. Certainly Vierick had nothing to do with my bill, which was prepared without the slightest outside assistance. Mr. Harre's article referred to me as "one of those willful men" referred to by the President more than a year ago, who in the Senate of the United States had talked to death the bill (S. 8322) authorizing the President to supply American merchant ships with arms. This reference to me was in complete error, as was another paragraph of the article, which suggested by indirection that I was the author of a bill to repeal the draft law. The official RECORD shows that I voted favorably on each of these laws. Naturally the American Defense Society is but too pleased to remedy the injustice which has been done to me, and they will shortly issue a public statement, disassociating me from any connection with Mr. Vierick, as far as its article applies, and at the same time correcting the mistakes I have just referred to.

I do not want to be disrespectful to any Member of this House. We all choose our own friends, and if any of us care to disregard others when we meet them on the street that is our privilege. But I can not help recalling that these gentlemen who are continually throwing the American flag around themselves are the very gentlemen who opposed real preparedness on the floor of this House for these many years past. I have their votes in my pocket, and I am prepared for a dozen of them, particularly on that side of the House, who are continually saying that we on this side are giving aid and comfort to the enemy every time we offer constructive criticism. They aim to prevent honest criticism by accusing us of disloyalty. It will have to be stopped. We all are heart and soul for our Government, and there should be no division on necessary war measures.

I require no apology for my patriotism. My father fought and suffered for that flag [pointing], and that is more than many of these new self-styled patriots can say. I love it as I love my life. [Applause.]

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FRANCIS].

Mr. FRANCIS. Mr. Chairman, on February 25 of this year I received a letter from one of my constituents which was unusual. It consisted of two newspaper clippings pasted on a sheet, with a brief written comment by the sender. The first clipping was an editorial entitled "Congress sound asleep," and which began "Alone of all the great nations engaged in this conflict we are making no preparations for the revolutionary conditions that will prevail at its close." The second clipping was a news item about one of our great powder companies. It featured a statement of its president that "the men who so successfully met the recent emergency are engaged with equal energy and foresight in working out plans for the use of these vast works after the war." The comment of the sender was, "Your attention is respectfully directed to these items."

My first reaction to this communication was that we had problems enough on hand to get the war going, and that to talk about reconstruction was premature. Reflection, however, led me to determine to give the subject an hour in the Congressional Library. To make a long story short, in that hour I found such an avalanche of material on present reconstruction activities in England, France, and Germany, covering every phase of social, political, and economic life, that I realized that the matter was of vital importance. Moreover, in addition to the foreign material, I found numerous domestic references, indicating that the subject was already coming to the front at home. Since that time, only four weeks ago, constantly accumulating news items have shown that it is definitely before us, and it is my opinion that it is time for Congress to give it earnest consideration.

True reconstruction is as much a war as a peace problem, and the time to face it is while we are yet in the midst of war.

A brief view of the reconstruction work abroad will show its extent and importance.

GREAT BRITAIN.

On August 21, 1917, Parliament passed an act known as the new ministries act. This created a ministry of reconstruction. It gave the minister full power to consider the problems which might arise out of the war, and to institute such inquiries and prepare such schemes, and to make such recommendations as he might think fit. It gave him an ample salary and staff and power to sit in Parliament. Under this ministry a great number of commissions and committees have been created to deal with questions already arising, and to arise at the close of the war, and many existing committees were gathered under its jurisdiction. A list of these committees, of their duties, and their personnel was published in England at the first of the year. It made up a large-paged pamphlet of 30 pages. A synopsis of this vast scheme was published in the Official Bulletin of March 14, 1918. In brief, under the minister, all reconstruction work is divided into 15 divisions. These 15 divisions cover the subjects of trade development, finance, raw materials, coal and power, intelligence, scientific and industrial research, demobilization and disposal of stores, labor and employment, agriculture and forestry, public administration, housing, education, aliens, legal questions, and miscellaneous.

Eighty-seven separate committees are doing the work. It would take too long to recite the names of these different committees and their respective fields. Suffice it to say that their greatest activity is on questions of trade development and in scientific and industrial research, but they reach into such questions as electricity, coal, horse breeding, local government, and mine-rescue apparatus, which gives us an idea of their inclusiveness. These many committees might seem enough, but one of my friends, who is investigating this work for himself, informs me that there are upward of 250 reconstruction committees at work to-day in Britain, including, for instance, several of the British Labor Party. Many have already made important interim reports. They are recommending the creation of a vast commercial structure with a trade bank, enjoying the support of the Government. Without going further it is superfluous to comment upon the value of this tremendous preparation. It not only forecasts the continued greatness of Great Britain, but it means that she has lost no time in preparing to recast her life and industry. This item of time alone is worthy of particular notice.

FRANCE.

In France the problem of reconstruction is particularly affected, if not overshadowed, by the problem of rebuilding her invaded territories, which, of course, are yet to be recaptured. An interparliamentary committee for the reconstruction of these lands has the problem in charge, and has working with it a subcommittee for the purchase of materials for the restoration. There is also a national institute for the care and reconstruction of disabled soldiers. In general, it may be said that there are upward of 300 laws which have been passed solely to aid in reconstruction. France desires to become economically independent. She has purchased great quantities of machinery abroad. She contemplates establishing a trade bank with ample capital. The State has already entered into contracts to turn over munition plants to various industries after the war, and expects to loan money to aid her shipbuilders. The Paris Chamber of Commerce is also working on the problem, and plans are being made to take an industrial census of the entire nation at the close of the war. I can not pretend to give a thorough outline of the reconstruction work of this nation. Not all the material on this subject is available and much of the available material remains untouched. It is evident, however, that France has started a thorough and practical consideration of the question.

GERMANY.

The information that comes to us from Germany has become limited of late. An Imperial Ministry of Economics was created October 21, 1917, and this has charge of the social, economic, and trade questions after the war. Germany and Austria have already entered into an extensive customs union. From such reports as we have it appears that there will be a national central organization for the purchase and distribution of all raw materials used in the nation upon the arrival of peace. A syndicate is to be created for the cotton trade to eliminate all commission houses. There is a scheme on foot to establish German manufacturing companies in foreign

lands with German capital, but with French and English names to defeat any prospective boycott.

A vast workmen's relief committee has been organized, and there are reports of huge trans-Atlantic liners already on the ways, to restore the lost commercial position. The German Government has always fostered trade and may at the close of the war take over the entire cargo space of its fleets. The British Trade Journal of January 31, 1918, gives a history of these new activities, and says that "the component States of the Empire have been honeycombed with committees appointed to investigate and report on the future of their respective industries or territories." While such information as I have found reflects chiefly upon the commercial side of the life of Germany, it points to a vigorous policy of reconstruction, and we may justly believe that it is being carried into other fields.

Let us now turn to our own country.

UNITED STATES.

When I started to inform myself about the situation in the United States I found it exceedingly difficult to do so. There was nothing available but a most miscellaneous lot of information consisting of clippings and items and articles from all kinds of publications dealing with totally uncorrelated activities. There were plenty of evidences of interest and preparation, but none of order and organization. It all reminded me of the opening days of the great war in Europe before our entry into it, when hundreds of charities sprang up overnight and imported us daily for contributions. Though eager to give, we could not tell where to give most wisely, and could not have given to all if we had given ten times more than we would. Our reconstruction situation to-day is about as chaotic as the charity situation was then.

Certain activities are at the present time outstanding.

The American Red Cross is studying the rehabilitation of wounded and crippled soldiers.

The Surgeon General is at the head of a movement to create reconstruction hospitals in large cities, which will include shops for vocational training.

The Federal Board for Vocational Education is studying the vocational rehabilitation of disabled soldiers and is training teachers for the work.

The Secretary of the Interior is agitating the question of eradicating illiteracy and teaching Americanization.

The educators of the blind are preparing to make their charges self-supporting.

Conferences at the University of Illinois and elsewhere have been studying the labor problem.

Numerous chambers of commerce are studying trade conditions after the war.

I am sure there are many more which have not been brought to my attention, because they are so rapidly developing. Valuable as these activities are, however, they are to-day almost uncorrelated. All about us charities and societies and communities are plunging into this work for themselves and going ahead independently, with few exceptions.

If left alone these organizations will develop into hundreds of separate committees throughout the country, overlapping in their fields, duplicating in their work, promoting disorganization and wasting a vast amount of energy. While our immediate reconstruction problem is simple and is chiefly to take care of our wounded, by a year from now it is going to be a tremendous one. If we are going to be forehanded we must prepare ourselves immediately to grapple with the tremendous and complicated problems of trade, finance, banking, tariff, food, labor, shipping, immigration, taxation, housing, and education that are going to perplex us as they have the foreign nations.

CONCLUSION.

What, then, is Congress going to do to meet this situation? Is Congress sound asleep, as the editorial said? On January 16 of this year a resolution to provide a commission to inquire into the advisability of establishing national insurance against unemployment, invalidity, and sickness came before the House. It carried an appropriation of \$50,000. The enacting clause was stricken out and the bill was defeated. Does that mean that Congress was not ready to face the problem of reconstruction? I do not think so. I think it was merely unwilling to authorize a pretentious committee to take such a small bite at so large a problem. I think that it realizes that something has got to be done, and would gladly consider some plan of wider scope to absorb and organize our reconstruction activities. I have confidence enough in Congress to feel that if the question were presented to it in a practical way it would respond with a generous appropriation.

The practical way has been indicated in England, France, and Germany, and we should profit by the experience of these coun-

tries. We should either have a secretary of reconstruction, who shall sit in the President's Cabinet and supervise all this highly necessary work, or we should have a commission of Congress, with a permanent organization to investigate and report on necessary legislation. Congress should face this great need promptly and should belie in this crisis the reputation of democracies for unpreparedness. [Applause.]

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10069, the river and harbor appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see now if we can not agree upon some time to close general debate upon the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, how much time has been consumed by each side?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina has used 2 hours and 32 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa 1 hour and 50 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I have requests for 2 hours and 50 minutes more time.

Mr. SMALL. So far as I can now tell I have requests for an hour and 50 minutes. Could we agree on general debate closing at the end of four hours to-morrow, say at 4 o'clock?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest that there are two or three or four conference reports to be taken care of to-morrow, and if a fixed time is set gentlemen are liable to get into trouble.

Mr. SMALL. Then we can fix it at so many hours, say four and a half hours more of general debate.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. That would not give me 2 hours and 50 minutes.

Mr. SMALL. Make it 4 hours and 40 minutes, the gentleman to have 2 hours and 50 minutes of that time.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. That is satisfactory.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, to-morrow is the day for the opening of the third liberty loan drive. Public announcement has been very generally made, and the Secretary of the Treasury is very earnest about the matter of inviting Members of Congress to participate in the movement wherever they may be available. I know a great many Members will be called away from the House to-morrow on that patriotic duty, and many of them would like to be here when the reading of the bill begins. They will be unable to participate in general debate, as they desire to do, because of the necessity of keeping these engagements made for this patriotic day. Can we have an understanding that after general debate is concluded and the first section of the bill is read there will be no further proceedings?

Mr. SMALL. That seems reasonable, and yet I am mindful of the fact that we are urged to conclude the bill as soon as possible. If much time is to be occupied to-morrow on conference reports there will be small opportunity to reach the bill under the five-minute rule. I hesitate to agree that we will not begin the reading of the bill if there is opportunity to make progress.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Four hours and forty minutes, if you start at 12 o'clock, will take us to 4.30 and after on Saturday afternoon.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania apply very strongly to Members on this side and particularly myself. I have engagements to talk in the liberty loan drive throughout the State of New York, and I can not possibly get back here before Monday. It would please me if we could agree not to start the reading of the bill until Monday.

Mr. SMALL. May I ask the Speaker unofficially if it would be safe to agree to that?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to think so. There are three or four of these conference reports and one can never tell what may happen about a conference report. If Members get to disputing about it it may consume an hour on each one.

So the Chair would think that the chances are that if you should run debate for four and a half hours plus the time that is taken up by preliminaries in the morning and these conference reports it will be time to "take out," as Col. Kilgore used to say.

Mr. SMALL. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we conclude general debate to-morrow, and having con-

cluded general debate on the bill that it will not be taken up under the five-minute rule until Monday morning.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That will be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. SMALL. So we will complete general debate to-morrow with that understanding.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does that mean the gentleman expects the bill will be taken up on Monday, making it in order on Monday?

Mr. SMALL. That was my intention, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Of course, if the Committee on the District of Columbia has important business that is their day, but the gentleman might talk them out of it. The request, as the Chair understands it, is that general debate on this bill be limited to four and a half hours to-morrow, of which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KENNEDY] shall control 2 hours and 50 minutes and the gentleman from North Carolina control the rest of it, but the bill shall not be taken up to-morrow under the five-minute rule.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I think the last suggestion made by the chairman of the committee was 4 hours and 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Yes; 4 hours and 40 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to state I am in hearty accord with what Mr. KIRCHIN said this morning about rushing matters. I have not taken up the time of the House, and the chairman has just stated that he wants to push this bill rapidly to passage. I am also in accord with that, but I have a very important amendment I shall offer at the proper time, and I would rather discuss it and have a reasonable length of time on the amendment. I would like to know of the chairman what will be his policy of allowing a little extra time when we reach the amendment stage, as much of the debate to-day has not been on this bill? I do not care to discuss my amendment and mix it up with other matters.

Mr. SMALL. Of course, I can not control the time, and I can only say I would make no objection to any request for a reasonable time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, the understanding is that we close general debate to-morrow before adjournment—

The SPEAKER. Yes; and not take it up under the five-minute rule to-morrow. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter:

The Clerk read as follows:

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having agreed to take part in the liberty-bond campaign, I ask permission to be excused from attendance in the House for two weeks.

Cordially,

FREDERICK C. HICKS.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 383, TO PUNISH DESTRUCTION, ETC., OF WAR MATERIAL, ETC. (H. REPT. 470).

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, on the part of the House conferees I desire to present a conference report on the bill S. 383, together with a statement on the part of the conferees, and ask that it be printed under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 383) to punish the destruction or injuring of war material and war transportation facilities by fire, explosives, or other violent means, and to forbid the hostile use of property during time of war, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed under the rule.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 3994. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize condemnation proceedings of lands for military purposes," approved July 2, 1917, and for other purposes; and

S. 3400. An act to regulate the pay of retired chief warrant officers and warrant officers on active duty.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 3388. An act to amend the emergency shipping fund provisions of the urgent deficiency appropriation act approved June 15, 1917, so as to empower the President and his designated

agents to take over certain transportation systems for the transportation of shipyard and plant employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, was there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER. No.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, April 6, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Elizabeth B. Beal, administratrix of the estate of George L. Beal, deceased, against The United States (H. Doc. No. 1017), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. TIMBERLAKE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8004) authorizing the resurvey or retracement of lands heretofore returned as surveyed public lands of the United States under certain conditions, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 463), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAINEY, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9830) providing for the disposition of opium, its salts and derivatives, coca leaves, their salts and derivatives, and any other drugs seized by the United States Government, in the enforcement of the provisions of the act of October 1, 1890, as amended by the acts of March 3, 1897, February 9, 1909, and January, 17, 1914, or the act of December 17, 1914, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 466), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GLASS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9457) authorizing national banks to make contributions to the American National Red Cross, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 469), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. WELLING, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8509) for the relief of Paul Guenther (Inc.) and Paul Guenther and Olga Guenther, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 464), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEAGALL, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2013) to reimburse J. B. Patterson, postmaster of Lacon, Morgan County, Ala., for certain postage stamps stolen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 465), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVILA: A bill (H. R. 11243) providing for the establishment of the port of San Juan, customs district of Porto Rico, as a port of entry for immediate transportation without appraisement of dutiable merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 11244) to amend section 5 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," as amended, relating to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to allow ownership of certain vessel lines by railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 11245) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and an act in amendment thereto approved October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 11246) to prescribe the personnel of the Army Nurse Corps, the qualifications for appointment, and the method of appointment therein; the method of discharge, removal, and relief from duty; the rank, pay, allowances, and leave of absence of members of said corps; and the conditions under which they may be retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 11247) providing for the protection of the uniform of friendly nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 11248) amending section 2 of an act entitled "An act to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars from January 1, 1859, to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURRY of California: A bill (H. R. 11249) to amend section 19 of an act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes, approved October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. FLOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 303) requesting the United States Food Administration to furnish to the House of Representatives information relative to its activities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVILA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 276) extending the operation of the act providing for the promotion of vocational education in the several States of the Union to Porto Rico; to the Committee on Education.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANTRELL: A bill (H. R. 11250) granting an increase of pension to Josiah B. Magruder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 11251) granting a pension to Joseph J. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 11252) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 11253) granting an increase of pension to William T. Abel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11254) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Murry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11255) granting a pension to Lucinda Hewkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 11256) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of Tacoma (Wash.) Business Women's Club and executive committee of the Authors' League of America, opposing the zone system as to second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVILA: Communication from the Teachers' Association of Porto Rico, expressing appreciation and gratitude to the President and Congress of the United States for conferring a larger measure of self-government and full citizenship upon that island and pledging loyalty and support of the Government in the world war; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DILL: Petition of Sherman Grange, No. 421, of Kettle Falls, Wash., relative to regulating food prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of the American Game Protective and Propagation Association, opposing the second-class postage rates of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Resolutions adopted by the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Woman's Club, protesting against increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of T. D. Cobbey, Charles H. More, Thomas E. Gray, and 14 others, all of Denver, Colo., praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of members of the Pierce County Medical Society, Tacoma, Wash., favoring House bill 9563; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the board of trustees of the Tacoma Commercial Club and Chamber of Commerce, Tacoma, Wash., favoring House bill 9286; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of various citizens and members of the United Spanish War Veterans of Tacoma, Wash., favoring the passage of House bill 1736; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition of Rev. Ira W. Cargo and 52 other residents of Clarkston, Mich., urging prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Flushing (Mich.) Farmers' Club, urging prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relating to the independence of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition of Langley & Michaels Co., Electric Appliance Co., Levi Strauss & Co., all of San Francisco, Cal., and Adolph Lewisohn, of New York, N. Y., favoring Senate bill 3963 and House bill 10526; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Employers' Association of Rhode Island, protesting against section of naval appropriation bill on page 77, lines 9 to 22; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TAGUE: Memorial of the Boston Surgical Society, urging the passage of House bill 9563 and Senate bill 3748; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of Rotary Club, of Chester, Pa., asking for the establishment of military tribunals for those showing treasonable intent or committing disloyal acts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, April 6, 1918.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, upon this anniversary day, so fateful in our national and international history, we would again set up our banners in the confidence of the righteousness of our cause and in the belief that our God is on our side. Grant, we beseech of Thee, in these days of renewed sacrifice and enlarged patriotism, that there may be an increased devotion on the part of the people to meet the demands of the hour. May Thy blessing rest upon those high in authority and in all the various phases of governmental responsibility. Hear our prayer. Bless also those beyond the seas who represent us, and may the grace of Thy wisdom be imparted to all in this hour. We ask for Thine own name's sake. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore assumed the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. OVERMAN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4102) granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Bonner County, Idaho, to construct a bridge across the Clark Fork River in Bonner County, Idaho.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9314) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2316) to promote export trade, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 383) to punish the destruction or injury of war material and war transportation facilities by fire, explosives, or other violent means, and to forbid hostile use of property during time of war, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill